

Also, a bill (H. R. 20515) granting an increase of pension to Theodore A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20516) for the relief of C. G. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20517) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 20518) granting an increase of pension to L. M. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20519) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Jacob Joyner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20520) for the relief of the owners of the steamboat *W. B. Savory*; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 20521) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Atherton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 20522) granting a pension to Bert Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 20523) granting a pension to Cleveland Shive; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 20524) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Premer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions adopted by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Taylor Lodge, No. 175, Newark, Ohio, favoring the passage of H. R. 17894 and S. 6165, to extend the boiler-inspection law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to export of arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Liberal Immigration League, relative to suspension of head tax on immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Diocesan Branch of the American Federation of Catholic Societies and St. Vincent de Paul's Lyceum, all of New York, protesting against the use of the mails by the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring House joint resolution 377, relative to export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of T. C. Beckwith, Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Netti E. Bauer, of Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Protests of the Hartford Business Men's Association, Hartford, Conn.; the New Departure Manufacturing Co., Bristol, Conn.; the Hartford Special Machinery Co., Hartford, Conn.; and Mr. Forrest Morgan, Hartford, Conn., relative to export trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of F. C. Monier, jr., of New Britain, Conn., relative to the exportation of firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Papers to accompany bill granting relief to the owners of the steamboat *W. B. Savory*; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for relief of the estate of Jacob Joyner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for increase of pension to L. M. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHAN: Memorial of Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against the passage of any legislation that will interfere with the exportation of the products of the United States to any country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of C. F. Kesting, J. C. Schmeds, B. H. Sanger, and H. Juse, of Los Molinos, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pilot Hill (Cal.) Local Socialist Lodge, favoring prohibition of exportation of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Luis Obispo (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Fred Miller, Redding, Cal., favoring repeal of that section of Constitution of the United States which reads: "The Congress shall have power to borrow money on the credit of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED: Petition of 252 merchants of the first New Hampshire congressional district, favoring the passage of H. R. 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of Hebrews of Meriden, Conn., relative to literacy test in the Smith immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against law prohibiting exportation of the products of the United States to any other country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 4, 1915.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy guidance and blessing as we start upon the uncharted paths of a new year. We recognize Thy goodness to us in all the providences that have surrounded us in the year that has gone, and we seek Thy favor that we may follow the light that shines upon the path of the just more and more unto the perfect day. We praise Thee for peace within all our boundaries, and for the high spirit of brotherhood that animates those who are the leaders of the people. We pray that Thy grace may be upon Thy servants in this Senate, that they may have the spirit of Christian statesmen, and that they may be witnesses for God for peace unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Hear us in our prayer; accept the praises of Thy people for Thy goodness; and guide us on in the fulfillment of Thine own divine plan for us as a Nation. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, December 29, 1914.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the further reading of the Journal may be dispensed with.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to hear it read this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects, and the Secretary will read the Journal.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the credentials of WESLEY L. JONES, chosen by the electors of the State of Washington a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Dodge, Schleswig, and Dubuque, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pleasant Valley, Kans., and a petition of the members of the ladies' classes of the Methodist Sunday School of Lúray, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have received a number of communications from citizens of the State of North Dakota urging the passage of legislation at the present session of Congress prohibiting the sale of munitions of war to the belligerent nations of Europe. I ask that the communications may be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] has just said, I wish to state that I have also received hundreds of individual letters and many petitions on the same subject, in reference to Senate 6688, the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I do not feel like presenting all the letters and having them printed in the RECORD, but I simply call the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Senate to the fact that I have received several hundred letters

upon the subject. It seems that the citizens of my State are deeply interested in the bill, and I hope and know that the committee will give it due consideration and take such action as they may deem proper.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Minnesota Peace Society, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against an increase in the armament of this country, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 7063) granting an increase of pension to Caro H. Moore, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Jamaica, Vt., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WEEKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C.; Kansas City, Mo.; Boswell, Ind.; Chicago, Ill.; and Jamestown, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Whitman, New Bedford, Lowell, Boston, Dorchester, Hardner, Charlestown, Cambridge, Everett, and Athol, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEE of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Browningsville, Md., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of John Crote and 150 other citizens of Rockville, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a petition of the Society of Friends of Woodbury, N. J., commending the President's efforts toward bringing about peace in Europe, and remonstrating against increased armament in this country, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition adopted by the Fruit Growers' Convention, held at Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection of all horticultural products at certain points of entry into any State, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for an appropriation for the purchase of a wire dragnet for southeastern Alaska and also for the construction of a lighthouse tender, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of Frank Britton Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, of Crawfordville, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Division No. 598, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Richmond; of Local Division No. 154, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Evansville; of Local Division No. 606, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Michigan City; of Local Division No. 12, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fort Wayne; of Local Lodge No. 136, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Fort Wayne; of Local Division No. 520, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Gary; and of the Wabash Railway Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Peru, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the extension of the boiler-inspection laws, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Aerie No. 248, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Fort Wayne, Ind., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Rush Creek Friends Bible School, of Kingman; of the Sunday school of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Fort Wayne; of L. M. Kreder, George W. Cate, J. C. Olwin, and 47 other residents of Greentown; of Whitewater Friends Church, of Richmond, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of 24 citizens of Aberdeen, Wash., and a petition of Lake Union Lodge, No. 116, International Order of Good Templars, of Seattle, Wash., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6919) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 851) thereon.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912, and I submit a report (No. 849) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the report.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROCK RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 6776) granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois, and I submit a report (No. 850) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA.

Mr. FLETCHER. By direction of the Committee on Commerce I report back the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 136) to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea, with the recommendation that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be five in number, and to be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the action suggested by the Committee on Commerce will be taken. The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 7124) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls to the city of Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7125) granting a pension to Robert H. Trollinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 7126) authorizing the submission to the Court of Claims of the claim of Albert J. Hewlett, of Pocatello, Idaho, for damages sustained by reason of the overflow of his lands in connection with the Government canal being constructed under the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior Department; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 7127) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Ludiker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7128) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Wright (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7129) granting a pension to Andrew J. Herring (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 7130) granting a pension to Celia A. Blodgett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7131) granting a pension to Esther Phillips (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 7132) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 7133) granting an increase of pension to H. B. Crouch;

A bill (S. 7134) granting an increase of pension to Robert Conn; and

A bill (S. 7135) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 7136) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Bisbee, Cochise County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7137) granting an increase of pension to George L. Neal (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 7138) granting an increase of pension to Fernando Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 7139) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Raphale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 7140) creating an additional land district in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7141) for the relief of C. G. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 7142) granting an increase of pension to John Sargent (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7143) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Gwin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7144) granting an increase of pension to John P. Simpson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7145) granting a pension to Charles M. Preston (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7146) granting an increase of pension to Albert Baur; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 7147) to amend section 4215 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WORKS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 218) to provide for the detail of an officer of the Army for duty with the Panama-California Exposition, San Diego, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. STONE. I submit two proposed amendments to Senate bill 6856, known as the shipping bill, which I ask may be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is now on the calendar. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table, to be taken up in connection with the consideration of that bill. However, if the Senator from Missouri makes a motion that they go to the Committee on Commerce, the Chair will submit it to the Senate.

Mr. STONE. For the present let them lie on the table. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be the order.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000 to pay Tom K. Richie, of Tucson, Ariz., the amount having been inadvertently covered into the Treasury on a forfeited cash recognizance, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LANE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 due the estates of deceased colored soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to be used for the erection of a national home for aged and infirm colored people in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19906), which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LANE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which were referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

SHIPMENT OF NAVAL STORES ABROAD.

Mr. HARDWICK. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 512), as follows:

Resolved, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate copies of all communications transmitted to or received from the Government of Great Britain touching the recent order of said Government declaring naval stores, turpentine, rosin, and resinous products absolute contraband of war, and the previous order of said Government declaring that the products above enumerated were not contraband of war.

Also copies of any other communications transmitted to or received from any foreign Government in reference to the classification of naval stores, turpentine, rosin, and resinous products as contraband of war.

Also copies of any communications transmitted to or received from any foreign Government relating to the detention of ships under American registry carrying cargoes of naval stores, turpentine, rosin, and resinous products.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. I ask that the resolution go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri objects. Under the rule, the resolution will lie over one day and be printed.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, which passed the Senate on Saturday last, may be printed showing the amendments of the Senate numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears none.

SALE AND SHIPMENT OF COTTON.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, some days since I had inserted in the RECORD certain communications from European cotton buyers and spinners in answer to questions propounded by me relative to the outlook for the cotton trade situation. I have to-day a translation of a letter received from C. A. Gruner & Co., of Bremen, Germany, which I send to the desk. I ask that it be read by the Secretary and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

BREMEN, November 20, 1914.

E. D. SMITH, Esq.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C., United States of America:

We take the liberty to answer your kind letter of September 29 in German, as the regulations now in force do not permit correspondence in English.

In answer to the questions asked, we will reply briefly as follows:

1. The consumption of American cotton in Germany and Austria is entirely dependent on the possibility or impossibility of regulated cotton importation. If the possibility of importing cotton were assured, the consumption would certainly be at least normal, and probably even heavier than usual, as East Indian and Egyptian cotton, the consumption of which is large in Germany and Austria, could be replaced by American cotton.

2. The question as to the size of the stock on hand we are not permitted to answer, for reasons easily understood.

3. Since the middle of September work has been going on in full force almost everywhere in the German spinning industry, with an increasing demand.

4. Should the war last very much longer a reduction in operations could only be avoided if the supply of cotton could be directly or indirectly guaranteed.

5. Funds for the purchase of cotton are plentiful in Germany, the increase in the rate of exchange brought about by the war not figuring in the equation.

6. As traffic in German and English vessels to Germany seems to be precluded, we are dependent upon neutral bottoms for our imports, therefore first of all upon American and Scandinavian ships. Unfortunately the space available from this source is small, and unless the United States make great exertions to place all in anywise available ships into the freight traffic the prospects for a considerable exchange of commodities between our country and yours are none too bright.

7. Our industry still has an adequate number of working hands at its disposal, especially as the spinning and weaving business is capable of greatly extending the amount of its female labor.

8-9. As said before, everything depends upon shipping facilities. The consumption of American cotton in Germany might be splendid if only certainty of importation could be secured. Every bit of cotton that can be landed in Germany would be willingly taken. The United States therefore have a strong incentive to make every effort in studying the question of transportation and in devising ways and means of promoting and assisting a sure exportation service to Europe. The success of such endeavors would necessarily mean a brilliant business for America.

THOMAS JEFFERSON AS ARCHITECT.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have had sent me a copy of the Architectural Quarterly, of Harvard University, which contains an article which presents Thomas Jefferson, to me at least, and I think to the mass of our fellow citizens, in an entirely new light. We know him as a man of letters and as a broad statesman, but this demonstrates the fact that he was an architect of exceeding merit. It seems to me that it would be a valuable document not only in connection with him, but for the well-being and knowledge of the people at large and that it should be printed as a public document. There are sundry illustrations. Whether the illustrations will be printed or not I can not say, but I desire to present it for the consideration of the Senate with the request that it be made a public document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paper will be received and referred to the Committee on Printing.

TEN EYCK DE WITT VEEDER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions? If there are none, morning business is closed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 694, being Senate bill 3000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title, for the present consideration of which the Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask to what bill the Senator from New Hampshire refers?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title of the bill will be stated from the desk.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3000) for the relief of Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder, commodore on the retired list of the United States Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, is that a bill which is already on the calendar?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. THORNTON. I object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask that the bill be read, so that we may know what it contains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks that the bill be read. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder, now a commodore on the retired list of the United States Navy, to the active list of rear admirals of the United States Navy to take rank next after Rear Admiral Charles Brainerd Taylor Moore, United States Navy: Provided, That the said Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, by the usual examination prescribed by law for the grade of rear admiral in the United States Navy, his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform the duties of said grade: Provided further, That the said Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder shall

be carried as additional to the number in the grade to which he may be appointed under this act: And provided further, That the said Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay of any kind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to have the report on that bill read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion having been made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of the bill, it must be disposed of without debate. The Chair is not prepared to rule just at this moment whether the reading of the report at this time would be in the nature of debate, and unless some Senator objects the Chair will direct the Secretary to read the report.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand this is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think, under the rule, this is not a debatable motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That has been the ruling of the Chair; but when it comes to reading the report accompanying the bill there is an element of doubt about it, and the Chair would always resolve that in favor of its being read.

Mr. GALLINGER. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. The question is on the adoption of the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just read. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall have to question that decision. I demand the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for the yeas and nays on his motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], which I transfer to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I desire to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and to state that he is paired on all votes with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when Mr. WARREN's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence from the city of my colleague [Mr. WARREN] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CRAWFORD (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WEEKS (after having voted in the affirmative). I notice that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and vote "nay." I desire further to state that the Senator from New Mexico is necessarily absent on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the negative). The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] having entered the Chamber and voted, I wish to withdraw the announcement of my transfer, and, in consequence of my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLISS];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Borah	Gallinger	McCumber	Smoot
Brady	Goff	McLean	Sterling
Brandeggee	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Townsend
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poinexter	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Works
Dillingham	Lippitt	Root	
du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Hughes	Reed	Swanson
Bankhead	Johnson	Robinson	Thomas
Bristow	Kern	Shafroth	Thompson
Bryan	Lane	Sheppard	Thornton
Camden	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Tillman
Chilton	Norris	Shively	Vardaman
Culbertson	O'Gorman	Simmons	Walsh
Fletcher	Page	Smith, Ga.	White
Gore	Pittman	Smith, S. C.	
Hardwick	Ransdell	Stone	

NOT VOTING—28.

Burleigh	Fall	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury
Cañon	Hitchcock	Myers	Sherman
Clapp	Hollis	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Clarke, Ark.	James	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Coit	La Follette	Overman	Stephenson
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Warren
Cummins	Lewis	Penrose	Williams

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion was not agreed to.

CIVIL WAR VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan. Mr. TOWNSEND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 392.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion now before the Senate will have to be disposed of.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not yield at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERMAN. As I understand, the motion to take up the urgent deficiency bill is privileged.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has before it the motion made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, is it in order to move as a substitute for that motion a motion to take up another bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can only be antagonized by a privileged motion.

Mr. OVERMAN. A motion to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill is privileged.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is made before 2 o'clock. The Chair will put the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], with whom I have a general pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before, as to my pair and its transfer, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer I made on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and must withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROOT (after having voted in the affirmative). May I inquire if the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. ROOT. Having a pair with that Senator, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] is unavoidably absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. McLEAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not voted.

Mr. McLEAN. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 38—as follows:

YEAS—35.

Borah	Cummins	Lane	Perkins
Brady	Dillingham	Lippitt	Poinexter
Brandeggee	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	McCumber	Sterling
Burton	Goff	Martine, N. J.	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Gronna	Nelson	Townsend
Clapp	Jones	Norris	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Oliver	Works
Crawford	La Follette	Page	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Hughes	Robinson	Stone
Bankhead	James	Shafroth	Swanson
Bryan	Johnson	Sheppard	Thornton
Camden	Lee, Md.	Shields	Tillman
Chilton	O'Gorman	Shively	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Culbertson	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	White
Fletcher	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Gore	Ransdell	Smith, Md.	
Hardwick	Reed	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—23.

Burleigh	Kern	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Cañon	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Stephenson
Coit	Lewis	Penrose	Thomas
Fall	McLean	Root	Thompson
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Warren
Hollis	Myers	Sherman	

So Mr. TOWNSEND's motion was rejected.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 6856, Order of Business No. 737.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before that motion is put, I desire to ask the Senator, if the bill referred to by him is taken up and made the unfinished business, whether he will be willing to have it laid aside for the purpose of taking up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. LODGE. Debate is not in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing that it shall be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. GALLINGER. Debate is out of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But Senators can interrogate one another as to the effect of the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would be willing to lay it aside temporarily in order to take up the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand, then, that if this bill is made the unfinished business, the Senator will lay aside the bill until the appropriation bill has been considered?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator can not do that.

Mr. LODGE. It requires unanimous consent to lay aside a bill temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Before the question is put, I should like to inquire what the bill is to which the Senator from Florida refers?

Mr. LODGE. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States, or of a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill the title of which has just been stated. On that motion the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. ASHURST, and he voted "yea."

Mr. DU PONT. I ask that the bill may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is too late.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the former ballot, I vote "yea."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia makes an announcement, which may stand for the day. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Being unable to obtain a transfer, I must withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the city on account of illness in his family. He is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. If my colleague were present he would vote "yea." I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Ashurst	Johnson	Poindexter	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Kenyon	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Kern	Ransdell	Stone
Camden	La Follette	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Robinson	Thomas
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thompson
Culberson	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Myers	Shields	Tillman
Gore	Norris	Shively	Walsh
Hardwick	O'Gorman	Simmons	White
Hughes	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
James	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—29.

Brady	Dillingham	McCumber	Sterling
Brandege	du Pont	McLean	Sutherland
Bristow	Gallinger	Nelson	Townsend
Burton	Goff	Oliver	Vardaman
Clapp	Gronna	Page	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins	
Crawford	Lippitt	Root	
Cummins	Lodge	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—21.

Borah	Hitchcock	Owen	Warren
Burleigh	Hollis	Penrose	Williams
Cañon	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Sherman	
Colt	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	
Fall	Newlands	Stephenson	

So Mr. FLETCHER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States, or of a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Florida, in charge of the bill which has just been taken up by vote, what the Senator's purpose is, so far as pressing the bill for immediate consideration is concerned, if the Senator chooses to answer my question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will state that, so far as I am concerned, we desire to press the bill and to get as early consideration of it and as early disposition of it as possible. I am perfectly willing, however, to lay it aside temporarily in order to dispose of the appropriation bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator, I assume, is aware of the fact that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has given notice that he proposes to file a minority report on this bill, and which has not as yet been filed. Does the Senator think it would be the proper thing to take up so important a measure as this before the views of the minority have been placed before the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say, in that connection, that there was what might be called an understanding, to the effect that the minority would file their views within three days after the majority report had been filed. The majority report was filed more than three days ago, and I assumed that perhaps the minority were ready to present their views.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. The minority report has been prepared. There has been some delay in printing exhibits and revising the copy of the report. I think it will be ready within an hour, however. As I recall, this is the third day. The majority report was filed on Wednesday, and this is the third legislative

day after that—one holiday, New Year's Day, having intervened, and Sunday.

I should say, however, that it was understood in the Committee on Commerce that the time given for filing the minority report should not interfere with the bringing up of the bill. That was the understanding at the time. Of course that does not foreclose any Senator on the floor from asking for time to give it more mature consideration.

Right here, if it is necessary, and if the Senator will yield further to me, I ask leave to file the minority report (Rept. No. 841, pt. 2) during the day. I think it will be ready to send to the desk within an hour.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think under the circumstances I might proceed with the consideration of the bill. We probably will not dispose of it to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it would be most extraordinary for any Senator to force consideration of a great measure such as this when those interested in it as deeply as some of us are have not had an opportunity to read the views of the minority. I suggest to the Senator that probably nothing will be gained by undue haste in this regard.

Mr. President, it has come to our ears on this side of the Chamber that there is to be undue haste in the consideration of this bill, that it is to be pressed in season and out of season, at seasonable hours and unseasonable hours. Those of us who do not think the bill is of sufficient consequence to warrant action of that kind will be compelled to resist it in every proper and parliamentary way.

I feel very sure that the Senator from Florida, who is always gracious and always fair, will see not only the propriety but the necessity of giving us a little time to prepare ourselves for the discussion of a measure that is of far-reaching consequence and that the people of the United States are very deeply interested in, and will be more interested in before this debate closes, I feel very sure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no desire, of course, to press the matter in such a form as would cause any inconvenience to the other side or prevent the consideration of the views of the minority. I am perfectly willing to say now that I will lay aside the bill to be taken up to-morrow upon the close of the morning business if that would be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, the Senator will probably have votes enough to take it up. I certainly have no objection to its being laid aside for the consideration of appropriation bills, which I think are of much greater consequence than this bill possibly can be to the people of the country. My view is that we ought to pass the supply bills and go home, and not to force it upon the Congress at this short session, after the experience we have had in the last three years of sitting here continuously, considering bills such as this. The time is too short to properly consider the measure, and it is not in the line of good legislation.

Of course we will all use our own judgment as to the proper mode of procedure; but I repeat, Mr. President, that any undue haste to press this bill upon the Senate will not, in my judgment, facilitate its passage. I think we ought to be dealt with generously about the matter. It is opening a great new question containing propositions that the American people will want to understand fully before the bill is enacted into a law.

For myself, having been extremely busy during the few days we have been in session in considering appropriation bills, I am not prepared at the present time, as I would wish to be, to proceed to the discussion of the bill, and as I shall endeavor to be if generous treatment is accorded to the minority, or to those of us who are opposed to the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have offered to temporarily lay aside the bill in order to take up the emergency deficiency appropriation bill and dispose of it. I have offered to temporarily lay aside the bill, to have it taken up to-morrow upon the conclusion of the morning business. Neither of these suggestions seems to be agreeable to the other side, and I know of no other way of proceeding except to go on in the regular way with the bill. Others may think it is not an important measure, but a great many people do. For my part I do not believe there is any more important matter affecting the interests of all the people of the whole country than what this measure will accomplish. But I do not want to delay it indefinitely. I want to bring the matter before the Senate and have it considered fully and in order and disposed of. I am willing to do anything I can to accommodate Senators on the other side and to meet their views, but I do not want to be in the position of doing nothing and having the time pass without any action whatever.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield the floor.

Mr. JONES. I wish to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire something of which he is probably aware as indicating the character of argument and the means the other side intend to use to put this bill through. The majority leader of the Senate was quoted as having said immediately after the President's message with reference to this bill, "We have the votes to put it through."

Mr. GALLINGER. I observed that, and I have had it whispered in an ear that always serves me well that, assuming they have the votes, they are going to resort to tactics which will be opposed as strenuously as possible, so far as a few of us are concerned, at least.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, we have the votes to put it through if ever we can get a chance to vote. Unless Senators on the other side adopt some plan or scheme of inexcusable and unpardonable obstruction we will get to a vote, and we have the votes to pass the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senators on this side should resort to the same tactics that the Senator's colleague resorted to on the immigration bill, would he think that that was very much to be condemned?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not discussing what occurred on other bills or what individual Senators have done. It is rather an impertinent question for the Senator to propound, and I think an improper one, to ask me to animadvert upon the conduct of any Senator, and particularly on that of my own colleague. I am speaking as to this bill. I am answering the statements made in the form of criticism by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is oversensitive.

Mr. STONE. No; I am not at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has on more than one occasion, with a great deal of earnestness and with some acerbity, during the past few months charged this side of the Chamber with unduly and improperly obstructing legislation. Now, Mr. President, for one, I propose to be the judge of my own conduct in this matter, and I shall pursue such a course in the debate on this bill as I think the importance of the measure demands at my hands.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me to call up House bill 20241, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. I object to laying the bill aside by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will have to be disposed of in some other way.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to say a very few words upon the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is before the Senate. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to make a motion?

Mr. OVERMAN. I give notice that I shall make the motion after 2 o'clock to take up the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, but I want to say a word in regard to this bill just taken up. It is a bill of very vast consequence. It enters upon a wholly new policy—one never adopted by this country before and, so far as I know, never adopted by any civilized maritime power. I know of no measure which requires more thorough debate than this one, and the question is not to be met by a bald statement that "we have got the votes." That, no doubt, is a great advantage. As Mr. Pitt said once, the time has now come to apply the majority, and I suppose that the Mr. Pitts on the other side are taking that view at this time.

But the rules of the Senate are designed to give us fair discussion, and this bill can not be jammed through to-morrow or the next day. Here is a bill of this enormous consequence brought in, on which there have been no hearings at all and on which information is lacking as to the facts, a bill on which even the minority report is not printed.

I think, Mr. President, that we are entitled to an opportunity to discuss this bill fairly and fully, and when that fair and full discussion is completed I assume a vote will be taken and the majority will then be applied.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply wish to suggest that there is no disposition on this side to limit debate or to prevent a fair and full discussion of the bill at all. There is no disposition, as

the Senator expressed it, to jam through the bill, even if we had the power to do it. Certainly we have not any power to prevent an ample discussion and consideration of the bill. We simply want to get it before the Senate for that very purpose, so that Senators can proceed, and, whether they are ready or not, we on this side are prepared to discuss it.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is our first duty to deal with the appropriation bills. The only thing which will make an extra session inevitable is the failure of some of the appropriation bills. I think our first duty, therefore, is to dispose of those great supply bills.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is but one before the Senate at present, and that is the emergency deficiency bill, and it is proposed this afternoon to call it up. I think it can be disposed of very shortly.

Mr. LODGE. We will see about that when we get to it. I have no objection to taking up the urgent deficiency bill, but I think there is likely to be a little conversation about some of the items in that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not familiar with the items in that bill.

Mr. LODGE. I am familiar with only one item, and I shall have something to say about it.

Mr. OVERMAN. To be frank, I want to make a motion after 2 o'clock, because if the pending bill is before the Senate at 2 o'clock it then becomes the unfinished business for every day. If the appropriation bill were taken up now, of course the shipping bill would lose its place. I will be frank to state that when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives I shall move to take up the appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. I shall certainly not resist that motion, but, Mr. President, I am referring more to what the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] said as to going on with this bill to-morrow, taking it up immediately after the routine morning business, not allowing us to consider any other bills in the morning hour, not allowing us to do anything with the calendar, but this bill is to be taken up and kept here all day, and I suppose that 11 o'clock sessions will be begun, and night sessions will be attempted.

Mr. President, I think this bill is altogether too important to be treated in that way. I think those who are opposed to it, as well as those who favor it, are entitled to a reasonable opportunity not only to speak but to prepare themselves. This is not a bill which can be dealt with in a few words. I regard the bill as thoroughly vicious legislation, both economically and internationally. I know that it will at once involve the Government in an expenditure of \$30,000,000. No human being of any ordinary sense will become a partner with the Government as the predominant partner in an enterprise in which it is avowed beforehand that it is the intention to lose money. Therefore we may be sure that the whole of the \$30,000,000 will be involved. To our liberal friends on the other side \$30,000,000 may seem a trifle. I think at this time it is an expenditure to be considered.

Then, Mr. President, having got our corporation established with the United States as the owner, not merely the predominant owner, but the owner, we are to put those ships into trade. I am speaking only of the economic side now. We are to put them into the foreign trade.

The United States, with all its vast power and all its great resources, is unable to carry on a merchant marine which will take care of all the freight of the United States, and wherever they place one of these Government-owned ships on a given route you will look in vain for an American vessel to be run there, for nobody will go into competition with a Government line. When you establish these ships on those lines, where they run you may be sure that all hope of building up an American merchant marine in that direction is dissipated once and for all.

Now, those are a few of the economic reasons which seem to me of very great importance.

Then we come to the international side. We are establishing a set of merchant vessels owned by the Government. Let us consider what that would mean in time of peace. It would create a very new condition. All Government ships to-day have reciprocal privileges. Ships of one Government and ships of another have reciprocal privileges in each other's harbors. No clearance is needed. No port dues are exacted. Is it to be supposed that these ships, trading ships, are to be given those privileges by other nations?

The matter of collisions, of ordinary accidents, raises many very important questions. I know of but one case where this matter was at all involved, the case known from the name of the ship as the *Parlement Belge*. It was a ship of that name carrying the mails, I think, between Ostend, or some Belgian

port, and an English port. There was a collision, and the question was raised about Government ownership, and it was finally decided on an appeal to the House of Lords that the ship did not lose her Government character because, in addition to the Government work, she also carried passengers. In that case the vessel was merely in the nature of a ferryboat, but here we have a whole series of ships loaded with merchandise, regular traders.

Now, those are some of the difficulties that arise in time of peace. How much more so in time of war? It is an undoubted neutral right, freely exercised by us during our Civil War, to stop neutral ships and examine them for contraband. It is a recognized right of international law. It is, however, one thing to stop a privately owned ship, and a very different thing to stop a ship that is Government owned.

What is to be the status of the men on board the ship? Are they to be officers of the United States like the officers of the Navy? Are the crew to be enlisted men or are they to be like ordinary captains and crews of merchant ships?

I merely mention a few of the questions that necessarily arise when we take this new, utterly new, step.

Other nations have owned railroads; they have owned telegraphs; they have owned telephones and other means of communication operated wholly within their own boundaries; but no maritime nation within my knowledge, no matter how strong the socialistic desire for Government ownership might be, has ever attempted to apply those doctrines to merchant shipping, because merchant shipping is not within their own control; it is not within their own boundaries; it goes out onto the high seas and has to meet a world of international complications. Have we not enough international complications now about us and likely to arise without encouraging new and perilous questions?

It is proposed, as I understand this bill, and as I certainly know the President said, to run these ships at a loss until they begin to make money, and then to turn them over to private ownership. Why, Mr. President, what becomes of this opposition to subsidy then? There never has been proposed any subsidy so gross as that which I have just quoted, and which was flatly stated by the President in his message.

Mr. President, I have no intention of arguing the bill to-day; I am not prepared to argue it; I am simply indicating some of the general questions of political economy and of international law which are involved in the bill. I think that not only as a matter of courtesy we should be, but as a matter of right we must be, permitted fully to debate this measure, and that every opportunity should be given to discuss a measure of this magnitude as it deserves to be discussed. I have no desire to throw any artificial obstructions in the way of the proper consideration of the bill; but I say very frankly that if any attempt is made to cut off proper discussion of the bill, I for one shall be ready to do what I have never before done in the Senate—use every possible means of parliamentary obstruction in order that we may have opportunity to discuss the bill fairly and fully and as a measure of such great magnitude ought to be discussed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Commerce which reported this bill, I think I should say that during the time when it was being considered by the committee I was engaged in work before other committees and was unable to be present. I did not enjoy the benefit of the hearings, if any hearings were held, and did not participate in the making up of the report.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do.

Mr. BURTON. I will say, in regard to hearings, that none were held. The minority requested that those who were experts in the shipping business, those who were posted on these subjects, might be called before the committee and brief hearings be had, but the majority voted down a motion to have hearings and insisted upon the immediate report of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. However that may be, Mr. President, in justice to myself I simply desire to say, in order that my position may be known, that I did not join in the report, not having been present, and I have not seen fit to present views representing the minority. I voted this morning against taking up the bill to-day for consideration. That in no manner indicates hostility on my part to the bill; but evidently it is a bill of such very great importance that it ought to be fully considered, and especially if hearings were not had in committee.

So far as I am concerned, my attitude is simply this: I have had a feeling that something should be done to promote our carrying trade under the American flag, and possibly this ex-

periment, by in a limited way establishing a line that shall be run on schedule time for a period, might demonstrate that it would end in a successful building up of such carrying trade; yet I have not reached a conclusion in the matter, and, for one, I want to hear a discussion of so important a question upon its merits and value before I shall be able to conclude whether or not I shall support the bill. On that account I do not care to be put in the attitude of having participated in the recommendation of the committee favoring the passage of the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, of course Senators know perfectly well, as I have before suggested, that we would not be able to prevent a full and exhaustive discussion of this measure even if we desired to do so; Senators understand perfectly well that they will have all the time they desire to consider the measure from all standpoints, upon every phase, and to discuss it as long and as fully as they like. There is no disposition to have it take any other course. We can not be charged with unduly pressing an important measure.

The bill has been presented to the Senate and a full report has been made upon it. The matter has been more or less under consideration, I have no doubt, in the minds of Senators anyway, for some time past. There were some hearings on a similar bill which was introduced in the other House. People who desired to be heard were given the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries there, which handled the bill. Certain hearings were had, which were sufficient, anyway, I take it, to satisfy that committee, and the bill was favorably reported in the other House.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is a House bill. Does the Senator from Florida say that there were hearings on the bill before the committee of the other House?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; precisely.

Mr. GALLINGER. Are such hearings printed?

Mr. FLETCHER. They are printed and they are available.

Mr. GALLINGER. They were very limited, were they not?

Mr. FLETCHER. The hearings were not very extensive, I should say, but my understanding is that sufficient opportunity was given for all the people who desired to be heard to be heard before that committee, and those hearings have been printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I asked the question for the reason that I have had letters from various parties in New England asking if hearings could not be secured before the Senate committee and complaining that they had not been given proper opportunity to present their views when the bill was before the House. I simply state that for what it is worth.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me for a moment, I wish to say that the House minority report, if I recall it correctly, complained that there was no time for sufficient hearings and that the information was lacking—that is one of the objections they made—on which to found the measure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not say as to what took place there, except that certain hearings were had, and that they are printed and are available. Whatever they show speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I can not add to what the report of the committee, which has been presented and printed and is on the desks of Senators, expresses regarding the general nature and purpose of this measure. I feel that it is unnecessary to go into a detailed consideration of the provisions of the bill so far as explaining the bill is concerned. It is a very simple measure; there are no complicated or involved proposition about it; it is easily and readily understood. No amount of argument or discussion of the provisions of the bill would give any further light than would be gathered by simply reading the bill. As I have said, the report of the committee, so far as we have been able to make it, fully covers all the features of the proposed legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not care to ask the Senator, if he expects to discuss it later, but I was going to ask him a question or two in regard to the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would be glad if the Senator would postpone his inquiries for the time, because I may answer just what is in the Senator's mind in the course of my remarks.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the Senator going to discuss the provisions of the bill at this time?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is my intention to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; the bill has not been read yet.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to conform to the Senator's desires, of course, but I took it from what he just said that he was not going into an explanation of the bill at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was saying that it was unnecessary to take up the bill section by section and discuss it by way of explaining the bill, but I was proceeding to say that, in so far as it involved a departure from the previous policy of the Government, there would be occasion for giving reasons for the measure, and as to that matter I propose to present, so far as I can, the reasons which seem to call for this legislation at this time. On that phase of the matter I shall offer some observations, perhaps a little extended.

Mr. NORRIS. The questions I desire to ask the Senator would not be connected with any reasons that might exist for a departure from present or past practices. I wanted to ask the Senator a few questions in regard to the meaning of some parts of the bill, but I will not ask them now if he prefers that I should ask the questions later on.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well; I have no objection if the Senator desires to ask the questions now. If I can throw any light on the subject, I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if the committee have made any change in the bill wherein it was provided that after the shipping corporation had been organized and had either built or purchased ships, put them in operation, and had operated various lines, it was within the power of the shipping board or of the President to dispose of the ships which have been so purchased to private parties? Has there been any change made in the bill in that respect?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no change in that regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest that it would be more regular to permit the bill to be read at this time and allow it to be presented formally to the Senate under the order heretofore adopted.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to suggest, Mr. President, that that perhaps had better be done.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course when the bill is read we will all understand it thoroughly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is necessary to read the bill under the order heretofore adopted. The Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I think that if this bill is to be read now, and therefore deprive the Senate of hearing it read later, we ought to have a quorum here to listen to it, and I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts makes the point of no quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bryan	James	Overman	Shafroth
Burton	Kenyon	Page	Sheppard
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Perkins	Stone
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Thornton
du Pont	Lodge	Polandexter	White
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Ransdell	
Gallinger	Nelson	Root	
Hardwick	Norris	Saulsbury	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will call the list of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAMDEN, Mr. CHILTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. O'GORMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. STERLING, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent on account of a slight indisposition.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. BORAH, Mr. GOFF, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. TILMAN, Mr. KERN, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of any corporation now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof or of the District of Columbia upon the terms and conditions herein mentioned.

SEC. 2. That the object of such corporation shall be the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels in the trade between the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America and elsewhere to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States. The initial capital stock of such corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share, but the shipping board,

with the approval of the President, may consent to or cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time, as the interests of the corporation may require: *Provided*, That the United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of each and every such increase. The United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of such stock at par, and the remainder thereof shall be offered for public subscription. The United States may further subscribe at par to an amount of such stock equal to that not taken by public subscription. Such corporation may begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States.

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board, for the purposes of such corporation, with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed \$30,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels.

SEC. 4. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to such corporation, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to constitute a first and paramount lien upon such vessels thus transferred and upon all the property of such corporation: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board.

SEC. 5. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

SEC. 6. That, subject to the direction of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power to vote the stock of the United States in such corporation and to do all other things necessary to protect the interests of the United States and to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act and such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided or to any other corporation or corporations now or hereafter organized, upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

SEC. 9. That the President of the United States shall at any time have the right, upon giving written notice of his intention to the corporation using the vessels under the provisions of this act, to take possession for use as naval auxiliaries in the United States Navy or for other purposes of any vessels used by such corporation at a reasonable price or rental.

SEC. 10. That a detailed statement of all expenditures under this act and of all receipts hereunder shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

SEC. 11. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000.

SEC. 12. That this act shall take effect from its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. Unless there is objection, the committee amendments will be first considered. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not wish at this time to enter upon a discussion of the merits of this bill, but I do wish to say a very few words regarding the discussion of the bill.

I think it is a bill of vast importance. I have known of no measure laid before the Senate in the past half dozen years which seemed to me weighted with such consequence as is this bill.

There are three major lines of consideration, upon each one of which we must regard this bill as of very great consequence to the people of the country. The first and least is that it proposes to embark the Government of the United States upon a very large expense in a business venture of a kind in which the private enterprise of the United States has uniformly met with loss rather than profit, and it proposes to embark the Government in such a venture practically without limit imposed by the Congress of the United States.

I say that is the least of the reasons why this bill must be regarded as of great importance. A second and more important reason is that it proposes to put the Government of the United States into the foreign trade at a time when that trade neces-

sarily involves frequent, almost constant, questions of critical importance, of great delicacy and difficulty, arising upon the law of nations regarding neutral and belligerent rights. It proposes to put the Government of the United States in a position where her good faith will be questioned, where her violation of the law of nations will be asserted, if any situations arise such as have been detailed to us within a few days by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. It proposes to create a condition where it will be no mere question of an individual citizen of the United States undertaking and succeeding or failing in carrying contraband to a belligerent, but where the same state of facts will raise the question of the United States violating its neutrality and taking sides with one belligerent or another.

That is the second reason. The third is that this bill proposes a reversal of the policy which has been followed by this Government from the beginning. It proposes to embark the Government of the United States in a business far more extreme than would be the ownership of railroads, far more extreme as an exercise of governmental authority than would be the ownership of telegraph and telephone lines. It proposes to put the Government of the United States in a position where it will step in and remedy the defects, the shortcomings, the failures of individual enterprise by raising money by taxation from all the people in order to carry on the business that individual enterprise has not carried on; and that, sir, means a complete reversal of the policy of the United States. It means a new departure on a line of Government action more important, more fateful in its results than any act which has ever been passed by this Congress since I, since you, Mr. President [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair], became a Member of this body. It means a repudiation more signal than has ever yet been made of the principles of the great leader of the party which "has the votes" to put this bill through.

Sir, there has been no discussion here since I have been in this body so imperative in its demands upon the Members of the Senate as the discussion of this bill. There has been no measure going so deep to the basis of our institutions as this bill. It comes here, sir, under circumstances which are repugnant. There was no hearing before the committee of the House on such a measure as we have before us. There was no hearing before the committee of the Senate. The demand for a hearing was refused, and the bill was reported speedily, peremptorily, with but slight opportunity for discussion; and now, sir, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], in advance, with some show of feeling, which I know was evanescent and which, I trust, does not even now continue, has stigmatized all discussion of this bill on the part of the minority as—what were the words?—"improper and unjustifiable."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], with that kindness and fairness which always characterize him, has told us that there was no disposition to interfere with the debate on this bill, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in advance gives notice to the country that the debate on this bill is to be regarded as obstructive, improper, and unjustifiable. I protest against any such spirit dominating this body, whether it be on the part of those who have the votes or not. May the time be far distant when there is so little spirit of independence, so little courage, so little loyalty to the duty of a minority in this body that such a notice in advance is accepted without just resentment.

Mr. President, the discussion of measures in this body does not consist alone in the making of speeches. We discuss measures with but very few Senators here. There are not 20 in the room at this moment. I counted them a few minutes ago, and there were 14. What, then, is the use of discussion? The use is this, that every speech is going to the country, that every hour passed is calling the attention of the country to the measure. The people of the United States begin to consider, begin to read, begin to discuss, and gradually week by week they form their opinions, and their opinions find their way back here. The process of discussion results ultimately in the reaching of conclusions which are conformable to the will and judgment of the people of the United States. That, sir, is why the long, patient, and sometimes tedious discussion of questions in the Senate of the United States is of vast utility, although we would suppose that it was useless from counting the men who are listening to the speeches which are made.

Now, Mr. President, this bill, fraught with such great consequences, must have and shall have the kind of discussion which brings these grave and serious questions before the people of the United States and which enables them to form their judgments upon the subjects which are involved.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR], with his well-trained mind and his habit of analyzing and stating propositions in clear and logical order,

has pointed out three lines of discussion of this bill. I wish to say to him that we are prepared to pursue those lines, and we believe we shall be able to meet every criticism offered under either the first proposition, that the Government is entering upon a business enterprise without precedent and without justification; the second proposition, that the occasion is such that we run the risk of becoming involved in international complications; and the third proposition, that we propose a reversal of the policy of the Government from the beginning. I think we shall be able to show that none of these objections or criticisms are well founded as to this measure.

Generally speaking, Mr. President, and briefly, upon that phase of the matter the bill provides for the organization of a corporation in the District of Columbia or under the laws of some State of the Union having a capital stock of some \$10,000,000, with the power to increase that later if it is determined wise; and that the corporation shall be authorized to enter upon this work and undertaking when 51 per cent of the capital stock is paid up. The bill provides that the Government of the United States, through a shipping board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General, shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the capital stock of this corporation; that the remaining 49 per cent shall be offered to the public, and if not taken by the public the Government is authorized and empowered to subscribe and pay for it.

Furthermore, through the shipping board the Secretary of the Treasury is empowered to employ Panama Canal bonds, 3 per cent bonds, running for 50 years, as I recall, and selling now at 99 cents in the open market, practically at par, to the extent of \$30,000,000, in the construction, purchase, charter, lease, and so forth, of vessels for this matter of taking care of the commerce of the United States with foreign countries. Then there is authority given for this corporation to issue its bonds, gold bonds, 4 per cent, and sell them to reimburse the Treasury for the amount expended out of the sales of the Panama bonds.

That is an outline of the plan whereby a corporation formed in this way with this capital stock is authorized to purchase, acquire, lease, charter, and charter to others, ships for the purpose of carrying our products to foreign markets and bringing the products of other countries to this market.

The corporation is then further empowered to dispose of these ships—to sell them, to lease them, as it may be advised is proper and wise—after they shall have served the primary purpose of opening routes of trade and of accommodating the emergency which is upon the country at this time.

Without going further into the details of the bill, I assure the Senate, in the first place, and the country, that it is not a permanent business undertaking on the part of the Government that is intended here. In the next place, the ships flying the United States flag owned by this corporation, instead of running a greater danger and risk than private vessels would run in the matter of carrying what may be regarded as contraband to foreign countries, the very fact, it seems to me, that they were ships owned by a corporation in which the Government was a majority stockholder; the very fact that the Government would have certain power and control in the management of the cargoes and in the navigation of the vessels, and the very fact that the Government is in a position, therefore, to guarantee that there is no violation of the international law in the business upon which the vessels are to be engaged, ought to solve many of the difficulties which we find confronting us to-day, and ought to relieve the situation of tension and stress which we gather from the press comments, at least, there is some indication of at this time.

Mr. President, it is necessary to get a full understanding of present conditions and realize the emergency that exists now, and, in this connection, for us to review a little some of the historical features and facts leading up to the present and to this measure.

We must realize, of course, that at the present time there is practically no merchant marine in foreign trade under the flag of the United States; that less than 1,400,000 tonnage exists to-day of American merchant vessels engaged in foreign commerce; that we are to-day in the hands of foreign ship-owning interests and absolutely dependent upon competitors in the markets of the world for the carrying of our products to those markets.

Various causes have been given for that situation. Among them as causes asserted for the decadence of American foreign shipping are—

First. The substitution of steam for sails as the motive power of ships and the substitution of iron or steel for wood in their construction. This cause need not have worked to our disadvantage. We were slow to adopt the new methods, but for-

sign countries did not hesitate or delay. While the steel ship costs 30 to 35 per cent more than the wooden ship, it lasts about twice as long, insurance rates are much lower on it and cargo, and it can be built with advantages for loading and discharging, and has other advantages.

Second. The increased cost of shipbuilding, due to increase in cost of materials and labor. This situation did not necessarily operate against us. The steel and iron we have and had when the change occurred in abundance. Our yards were equipped with excellent machinery and appliances. While wages were higher here, this was largely offset by efficiency and other conditions. There was no way to guard against the imposition which our laws allowed our steel makers to practice, such as charging our shipbuilders \$32 per ton for steel which they delivered in Belfast at \$24 per ton.

Third. The increase in maintenance and running expenses. This item need not have been large. The total wage cost is only about 8 to 18 per cent of the total operating expenses of a vessel. An infinitesimal increase in rates or foregoing a small amount of profit would have covered it.

Our existing registration laws forbid any foreign-built vessel from engaging in our coastwise trade. The remedies suggested have been—

First. Free ships. The Dingley law and subsequent tariff acts relieved of duty all material and supplies entering into ships built in the United States for foreign trade. It did not apply to domestic ships, because of the insistence of protected interests. This has not seemed to have any material effect on our merchant marine. To repeal our registry laws and allow shipowners to buy or build wherever they could do so at least cost the ships needed for our commerce would not solve the difficulty because, it is claimed, foreign ships have lower wages on shipboard and, in some instances, receive bounties. We have changed our laws so as to admit to American register ships purchased by Americans anywhere for foreign service, but it appears that as yet it has brought no ships under our flag. It is claimed, also, our laws requiring that American citizens shall officer ships under our flag adds to cost of operation and deters American register. We have authorized the suspension by the President of that requirement.

Second. Discriminating duties. This leads to commercial conflict, in the first place, and, in the next place, we have such a provision in our tariff law. The trouble is, it clashes with numerous treaties and, again, is now involved in litigation. We can not rely on that remedy at present.

Third. Bounty for construction and subsidy for operation. This has been the principal remedy proposed and upon it the greatest stress has been laid.

Turning casually to the hearings before the Merchant Marine Commission, volume 3, page 1753, Rear Admiral P. F. Harrington is quoted:

We must first get the ships, and I think when we get the ships and acquire the ship-owning habit, then the matters of shipbuilders' interest and of shipowners' interest will eventually right themselves, so that they will be able to compete with people abroad.

At page 1754 he said:

My mind rejects the idea of free ships for the reason I stated. My judgment is adverse to the idea of discriminating duties, and there seems to me to be nothing left but a direct payment to shipowners.

At page 1753 he says:

It seems to come right down to this conclusion. If the country wants a great merchant marine, it must pay for it, very much as other nations do.

Rather inconsistent with the idea of subsidy or bounty is the statement at page 1750:

Indeed, the subsidized lines have failed of success in competing with lines which were not subsidized, a conspicuous instance of which was the withdrawal of the Roach Line to Brazil.

Then he gives an interesting account of the American line, subsidized both by the United States and Brazil, which failed. The most perfect and successful cargo carriers—the tramp steamers—were never subsidized by any country. Combinations, rebating, and manipulations will overcome subsidies and bounties. It would seem that none of the means for establishing a mercantile marine which have been suggested can be depended upon to work a success. Equally it follows, since all other methods have been exhausted or found not feasible, there is but one thing to do, and that is to have the Government intervene directly as proposed in S. 6856.

THE SITUATION PRIOR TO AUGUST 1, 1914.

Ships flying our flag carried only about 5 per cent of our commerce. Ships flying foreign flags conveyed freight and passengers to and from practically every port of the world to and from our shores. Great combinations of foreign interests worked against any effort in this country to establish over-sea lines. With unexcelled and improving means of transporting

our products and goods to the ports, indeed our "control stops with the shore." While "man marks the earth with ruin" across the ocean we are commercially helpless on the seas. Our competitors in trade have for years carried the products of our fields, forests, mines, and factories abroad. They have exercised full sway, fixing the sailings, dictated the routes, farmed out the ports, fixed the rates of freights and passenger tariffs, determined the kind, extent, and quality and cost of accommodations for passengers. They alone have had the final word as to where and when we might send our goods. Their one object has been, primarily, to earn profit for themselves. They have not been concerned with any notion to develop trade for us or open routes for our benefit or for the advantage of those with whom we were interchanging. They have simply regarded their own interests, and we have gone on taking and enjoying what was parceled out to us that might be of advantage to those transporting our products and goods.

Particularly with regard to the commerce between North and South America, the shipping monopoly flying European flags and working for their countries have exercised absolute control.

The testimony of Mr. Sidney Story and Mr. William Lowry before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under H. R. 587, gives the experience of the Pan American Mail Line, and Mr. J. J. Slechta shows that of the Lloyd Brazilian was similar. Both were forced out of business by the combination of foreign competitors. Agreements governing the traffic to and from South American Republics were regularly entered into, and no independent line could live. (See pp. 154, 164, 165, 166, 170 et seq. of vol. 4 of the report.)

The testimony of shippers and shipping experts clearly shows that a combination existed on the part of foreign shipping interests, having for its purpose the control of America's over-sea commerce, and, in a way, to wring annual tribute from it and to checkmate any efforts made here to expand our trade.

This testimony further showed that there was not a single ship under our flag in the carrying trade between the United States, Brazil, and Argentina, and that all other lines known as American lines—operating ships under foreign flags—had certain routes allotted to them in the trade with the west coast of South and Central America; that these so-called American lines were members of the conference lines, and all dominated by the Foreign Shipping Trust, with headquarters in Europe; that the tariffs or freight rates from United States ports to foreign ports, notably to those of South America, were dictated from Europe and were made so as to secure the bulk of the flow of commerce from South America to Europe and vice versa.

The dividends declared by these foreign lines furnished sufficient denials of the statements that the American lines could not compete with European lines on a legitimate basis. (See Report on Steamship Agreements and Affiliations, etc., vol. 4, pp. 415 to 419, and chap. 6, p. 151 et seq.)

So that not only was our over-sea transportation almost exclusively under foreign flags, but a combination of shipping interests existed, dominated from Europe, which effectually shut out any independent line from the United States.

The United States produces a surplus of the prime necessities of life, which other nations must have or go unclothed and hungry. This means a position of supreme power; a power greater than military or naval power and more lasting, because peace lasts longer than war. But these necessities do not yield to us or serve others as they should, so long as the means of delivering them are in the hands of others and we have no voice on the seas.

We should have our own messengers to send when and where we will over the free and open highways of commerce. We are like a merchant prepared to sell his goods but unable to deliver an article.

The means for carrying our products and manufactures to the market places throughout the world and bringing back to us the commodities we want in exchange, and the drummers over the sea, like the traveling men on land, should be at our command.

We must confess to a humiliating lack of foresight or inexcusable neglect, when we note that upon a foreign trade totaling over \$4,200,000,000, over half of which has been in exports, we have permitted shipping trusts and combinations, all under foreign flags, to levy an annual tribute of between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000.

Unquestionably a merchant marine under the American flag is essential to our full commercial development.

Adequate and efficient transportation on the seas under the American flag, owned and controlled exclusively by Americans, it is our business to produce.

We need ships which will deliver our mails direct, and invoices and bills of lading, and do the things which will build up per-

manent trade relations; carry our abundant surplus from fields, forests, and factories to markets; unseal the doors of our shipyards; maintain prosperity within our borders. We must see to it that a war between other countries will not have the effect of paralyzing our industries because we have no means of transporting our products.

Little Holland, with an area of 13,171 square miles, not half as large as Florida, has a mercantile fleet of 400 steamers. As a maritime, financial, and colonial power she takes high rank. So far as I have found, there is no subsidy or bounty for the Netherlands ships.

We should have profited by our experience during the Boer War. That war began in October, 1899. It caused Great Britain to withdraw 250 steamships of an aggregate of 1,000,000 tons from commerce to transport and supply service. The effect was to "cripple opportunities afforded by sending freight to and from America and to raise freights." Our farmers were the worst sufferers, as corn exports were cut off, cotton shipments were reduced—decrease in cereal shipments the following year was 1,750,000 bushels—all because we lacked the ships to deliver the goods. Our total exports of breadstuffs shrunk from \$317,879,746 in 1898 to \$269,955,771 in 1899 and \$250,786,080 in 1900.

The British shipowners withdrew their best vessels to accept profitable Government charters and substituted a few old, cheap craft, but they marked up freight rates 30 per cent, so they made as much out of our diminished commerce as before.

Considering both diminished exports and increased freight rates, the direct and indirect loss to our farmers because of foreign monopoly of a large part of our ocean-carrying business was undoubtedly many million dollars.

An article on the "Development of the American Merchant Marine and American Commerce," Document 141, printed at the request of Senator GALLINGER, January 15, 1906, sounds prophetic in this paragraph after mentioning the experience and effect from the Boer War I have referred to:

WHAT OF A GREATER CONFLICT?

The withdrawal of the trans-Atlantic liners flying British and German flags would mean paralysis to the export trade and a crushing loss to our millions of producers of breadstuffs, cotton, and provisions. Millions of men far inland who had never seen the sea would be demanding of Congress an explanation of why there was no American merchant marine and insisting on an answer.

This article further says:

NO SHIPS TO SOUTH AMERICA.

But it is not only in our trans-Atlantic trade that we are at the mercy of Europe. As President Roosevelt says in his message to the present Congress: "It can not but be a source of regret and uneasiness to us that the lines of communication with our sister Republics of South America should be chiefly under foreign control."

And:

HURTING THE FARMERS MOST.

One accompaniment of the working of this foreign shipping "combine" and these "triangular voyages" is that our American exports to Brazil have fallen from \$15,135,000 in 1895 to \$10,955,000 in 1904. Congress refused a mail subvention of \$200,000 a year and cut off four millions of American commerce. This loss falls most heavily, not on the coast States, but on the agricultural States of the West, for our exports to Brazil were very largely breadstuffs and provisions. We sold to Brazil \$2,683,000 worth of flour in 1895 and only \$1,785,000 in 1904. American consular and other representatives in Brazil all agree that this shrinkage in the flour trade is due primarily to unfavorable freight rates and an irregular shipping service—to a lack of American ships owned and run in American interests. As Consul General Seegar reports, "A Rio commission house made a profit by shipping flour from New York to Europe and thence to Rio, although the increased difference of travel was over 3,000 miles."

NATIONAL AID MEANS LOWER RATES.

From the days when Congress, under the admonition of President Polk, granted the first mail subventions to American steamers on the route to Europe national aid to shipping has always brought not only improved transportation facilities but lower freight rates. Says Lindsay, the historian of the British merchant marine: "Before the Collins (American trans-Atlantic) Line was established the Cunard steamers were receiving £7 10s. sterling per ton freight, which was so much a monopoly rate that in two years after the Collins Line had commenced the rate of freight fell to £4 sterling per ton."

That this is still the result of State aid to shipping is demonstrated anew by some fresh evidence of especial interest to the farmers of the Western States. In 1901 Canada granted a subsidy of \$150,000 for a monthly steamship service from Montreal to South Africa. In 1901 Canada sent only \$26,815 worth of goods to Cape Town and Natal. In 1903 Canada sent \$2,228,000 worth.

AN AMERICAN LINE TO SOUTH AFRICA.

No American steamers run from our ports to South Africa. The trade is in the hands of a foreign shipping monopoly which has lately made a heavy advance in rates. Consul General Washington, who reports "a remarkable growth in the Canadian trade with South Africa since the granting of an annual subsidy by the Canadian Government in 1901," also states significantly:

"A trade report received here from New York dated August 1, 1905, quoted the rates for the next direct steamer from that port to Cape Town as not exceeding \$6.70 per ton; to East London and Durban, \$7.31; and the September sailing from Montreal at \$4.26 for Cape Town and Port Elizabeth, and \$4.87 to East London and Durban."

In other words, because of the establishment of a direct subsidized Canadian line freight rates on Canadian breadstuffs, lumber, provisions, etc., from Montreal to South Africa are from \$2 to \$3 a ton below the

rate exacted by foreign steamships on similar American products from New York to South Africa.

I may say that for the fiscal year 1913 the exports from the United States to Latin America amounted to \$442,419,973 out of a total of exports \$2,465,884,149, 17.94 per cent of total to Latin America, or 6 per cent going to South America. Imports from Latin America to United States, \$323,775,885 out of a total of our imports of \$1,813,008,234, or 17.86 per cent from Latin America, 12 per cent coming from South America, including Mexico and Central America.

WHAT HAS BEEN OUR SITUATION SINCE PRACTICALLY ALL THE OLD WORLD BECAME INVOLVED IN WAR?

Heeding no warnings, closing our eyes to the inevitable in such a contingency, we have drifted along, wrangled some over ways and means, and did nothing. The consequence, which should have been foreseen and guarded against, has been practically a demoralization of our foreign trade. Our abject and sole dependence on foreign ships has placed us in an impotent and deplorable situation. German and Austrian shipping to the amount of some 5,000,000 tonnage has gone suddenly out of commission. A large number of the merchant ships of England, France, and Russia have ceased to engage in peaceful commerce. There is a ship famine on here. The rates of freight have soared to the prohibition point. Cotton is selling in Germany at 19 cents per pound and in our market at 7 cents, and Germany wants 500,000,000 pounds, and we have fifteen times that for sale, and the belligerent nations themselves are willing we should take this cotton to this customer, and we find ourselves without the means of doing it. Phosphate, turpentine, and rosin, and other products which have found their chief markets abroad are weighing down our docks, but we have no craft to take them to the waiting markets. There have been some lines operating under neutral flags, a small tonnage under our flag, but wholly inadequate for our needs, and we have during the past four months paid in freight rates over and above the normal rates, more money than would be required to purchase 60 ships at \$500,000 each. That has been the tax and the burden upon our producers. In the last four months we have actually lost more money than would have been sufficient to have carried out every provision under this bill. Still the rates increase.

A gentleman on board the *New Amsterdam*, which sailed from Rotterdam August 9 for New York, told me he had purchased a cargo of rice or rice meal and loaded it at Hamburg, taking bills of lading and all shipping papers and paying 75 per cent, about \$40,000, the remainder to be paid when the goods were delivered in St. Louis.

Just before the vessel was to sail she was notified not to go, and this American citizen came away with a claim in his pocket for some \$40,000, which he hopes to get liquidated some of these days. If his property had been in American bottoms, he would have come along with it without interruption. No doubt there are numerous instances of that kind in the ports of other countries as well.

No country, whether at war or not, has jurisdiction over the high seas. No country, belligerent or otherwise, has any right to stop our ships on the open seas engaged in customary commerce and say you shall not proceed. This is not denying, however, the right of belligerents to haul to and even board merchantmen to ascertain whether they carry contraband or not and from whence they come and whither bound, but this should be done in an orderly, decent way, without any unnecessary delay or hardship.

The Creator alone rules the seas, and "to all His creatures they are as free as the air they breathe and must be kept so while man remains on earth." No nation can exercise sovereignty over the oceans and seas, which are the inheritance of all the people of the world. They are the highways of commerce for all nations, all races, and all people.

Exporters under international law have the absolute right to ship their goods to any neutral country, regardless of whether they are contraband or not.

If such goods are declared not to be contraband, they can be shipped to Germany, England, France, Russia, or any warring nation. If contraband goods are shipped from the United States to another neutral country, with a view to further shipment to a belligerent nation, the entire shipment may be regarded as a continuous one and the goods will be subject to seizure. It is otherwise if the goods are really intended for a neutral country.

It is clear that goods of all kinds, steel, meat, and everything, contraband or noncontraband, may be shipped without interference from this country to any neutral country.

Goods not declared to be contraband may be shipped to any warring nation as well as to the neutral countries.

If these shipments are made in ships carrying the flag of the United States, that fact ought, and will, no doubt, be accepted

as a guaranty of faithful observance of these principles in making and throughout the shipment. Cargoes of dyestuffs and chemicals are allowed to come from Germany by way of Rotterdam, and cotton can be taken in return the same way, provided ships under the American flag perform the service. The trade of the nations at war with neutral countries has been seriously impaired. Our trade with those neutral countries ought to greatly increase. The contending nations, with no purpose of that kind, we grant, hit us a severe blow when they swept the seas of their own ships, because they were the carriers on which we hitherto relied. South America, which imports over \$900,000,000 in value annually and pays for that with her products, finds many of her markets closed, and, like ourselves, is without the ships to transport her own products or bring to her people the goods they need.

PRIVATE INTERESTS WILL NOT OR CAN NOT SUPPLY THE WANT.

Of the 600,000 tons eligible, only 350,000 tons have come under the American register in response to our call under the act permitting American-owned vessels, wherever built, to take United States register for foreign service. Transportation facilities must be provided, and this whether there is immediate profit or loss on the procuring and employment of those facilities. We must have the means of moving our commerce freely and open new routes for ourselves and those to whom the old channels are closed, and we may feel assured the new channels will remain permanently and become mutually profitable to those using them.

We need the ships—

First, to serve American commerce for the benefit of the whole American people, in order that American farmers, manufacturers, and merchants may send their products and goods over the seas without interference by the demon of war.

Second, to prevent the exorbitant rates, which are approaching the prohibition point in many instances.

Third, to open up new routes, cultivate new markets, and establish our flag over the seas and carry it into every civilized port.

Never again should the United States be found dependent, in a great crisis or otherwise, upon any country or countries for the means of transporting their goods.

Peace or war, it is economic folly to continue permitting—yes, inviting—other countries to dictate the ocean freight rates, the insurance rates, and similar charges, which foreigners have hitherto exacted from our vast foreign commerce. That means putting it in the power of competitors to determine and absorb all profits or advantage from our foreign trade. If there are never to be any more wars by any country anywhere, we still must have a great merchant marine to save ourselves hundreds of millions of ocean freight charges.

We can never hope to be the great commercial Nation we can be if we occupy our present position, where wars among other powers deprive us of their merchant marine, which are the only bottoms we have had to do our carrying for us. Our neutrality is of no avail when other powers at war can not let us have their ships to freight our cargoes across the seas. Our vast foreign commerce in these circumstances is entirely at the mercy of the other powers.

Reviewing the matter somewhat, let me summarize the situation.

When war was declared in Europe England had about 5,000 vessels in the foreign trade, Germany had about 2,000, and the United States had only 6 vessels engaged in trans-Atlantic traffic. These 6 American vessels had a total gross tonnage of 70,362. Two vessels of the German merchant marine—the *Vaterland* and the *Imperator*—exceeded the entire American trans-Atlantic merchant marine by about 25,000 tons. Only one American line operated to South America, to wit, the United States & Brazil Steamship Co., from New York to Brazil. Recognizing the exigencies of the situation, Congress passed an amendment to the navigation laws whereby foreign-built vessels, when owned by American citizens or corporations, could register under the American flag for foreign trade. It was thought that this would bring relief, but it did not.

The President signed the bill on August 18, 1914. On November 14, about 90 days later, the Department of Commerce reports that 101 vessels have registered under the American flag. Their total gross tonnage was 350,000. About 20 of these are sailing vessels, 7 are less than 1,000 tons gross, 10 less than 2,000 tons, 11 less than 3,000, 9 less than 4,000, 18 less than 5,000, 13 less than 6,000, 17 less than 8,000. There are none over 8,000 tons, and few would be classed in size as first-class cargo boats.

It is not intended in any way to disparage the importance of the entry of these vessels to American registration, yet the

value of the increase to American commerce should not be overestimated. While they are thrice welcome, they have not brought the necessary relief. The majority of these vessels are merely continuing the work they have heretofore done in handling freight from American ports. Of the 85 vessels admitted, 23 belong to the United Fruit Co.'s fleet, which continue to ply between the United States and Latin-American ports in the fruit trade; 11 are tankers of the Standard Oil Co. carrying that company's products; 10 belong to United States Steel, handling that company's business, or 44 out of the 85 ships, representing over 50 per cent of the total newly registered tonnage, have added nothing to the transportation facilities for American commerce. The value of the exchange from foreign to American flags by these companies should be fully appreciated and their actions commended, yet the conditions surrounding this transfer should be fully understood.

Of the 85 newly registered ships, less than half are engaged in the trans-Atlantic trade. Including the 6 vessels already under American register, the aggregate gross tonnage of all American vessels engaged in the trans-Atlantic trade is less than 200,000 gross tons. It will not represent one-third of the tonnage of many individual corporations of other nations. Of the German merchant marine, the Hamburg-American has 457 vessels, aggregating 1,361,819 gross tons, the Hamburg-South American, 59 vessels of 268,000 gross tons, and the North-German Lloyd, 168 vessels of 811,000 gross tons. Of the English fleet the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. has over a million gross tons. The British Indian Steam Navigation Co., 142 vessels of 660,000 tons; the Peninsula Oriental Steam Navigation Co., 70 vessels of 546,000 tons; Furniss, Withy & Co., 125 vessels of 440,000 gross tons. Besides there are many other smaller English companies, carrying the total gross tonnage of England's merchant marine into the millions. One French company has a gross tonnage of 390,000 tons—more than all the American trans-Atlantic merchant marine—and one Japanese corporation owns a fleet of 85 vessels of 368,000 gross tons. Any of these individual corporations will exceed in tonnage and equipment the entire American merchant marine engaged in the trans-Atlantic trade, including vessels recently registered.

The United States has annually paid nearly \$300,000,000 to foreigners to carry our goods. This is a goodly sum in these days of foreign exchange balances, yet it means more than this when our money can not buy the means for transportation of our goods.

German and Austrian shipping have been driven from the sea; the English and French fleets have been considerably reduced by being pressed into Government service or by destruction. We are dependent upon the English and French vessels, the ships of neutral countries, that come to our shore, and the few American bottoms that are capable of ocean voyages. With the foreign vessels attending first to the needs of their own people and their commerce with other parts of the world, we must content ourselves with what we can get.

A shortage of ships is the consequence. Chartering prices have in some cases increased 400 per cent in 60 days, and to obtain ships flying the American flag is almost impossible at any price.

We therefore face the proposition of doing without a merchant marine or following our previous methods of private development, which has resulted in failure, or obtaining the desired result immediately by Government purchase and ownership. This will mean at least a foundation for an American merchant marine. It does not mean that private capital can not also invest. It has been suggested that private corporations may charter these vessels from the Government at an adequate rate, which would pay sufficient interest and depreciation charges, so as to protect the Government and enable it to yearly add to the fleet through this income.

The idea is not a new one. It is not paternalism. It is a commercial necessity, and will mean much to the future of America's foreign commerce. The value of this plan to the Nation in time of war is incalculable. The Government would have the right to use this merchant fleet as auxiliaries and transports, of which our Navy is much in need. England during the present war has commandeered over twelve hundred merchant vessels out of her fleet of five thousand, and one can readily realize our needs in the event of war with a first-class power, when our entire merchant marine consists of less than a hundred ships.

Independent of any question of the shortage of ships at present; without regard to whether ocean freights are exorbitant or not; even ignoring conditions brought on by or resulting from the war now waging in Europe, the fact is, the consensus of opinion is, and the quite universal conviction is, the United States

needs greatly and, if their interests are considered at all, must have a merchant marine owned, controlled, and operated by this country. This need of ocean carriers under our flag has found expression in the platform pledges of all political parties since 1844. It has been promised the people continuously for over 50 years. The only difference among us has been as to how that should be accomplished. Tonnage taxes, discriminating duties, "free ships," subsidy of mail lines, all have been advocated and all tried.

We find ourselves in greater need and less equipped to-day, comparatively speaking, than at any period in our history. Indeed, at one period we surpassed all other countries in ocean carriers. Private enterprise will not supply the need. Foreign ships handle our foreign commerce. We are solely dependent on them, and without them our rich surplus of agricultural products, manufactures, and goods moving in trade must stop at our wharves. That this is a profitable business, the transporting of our freight and passengers to foreign ports, we have but to refer to the profits, as shown by declared dividends, those lines engaged in it have made. Enough is said when it appears that profit has been sufficient to attract \$100,000,000 of American capital invested in those foreign lines, mainly in the International Mercantile Marine Co. When the Merchant Marine Commission in 1904 inquired whether they would bring their ships under the American flag if a "free-ship" law was favored, they replied they would not. The reason given was that under a foreign flag they had an advantage of cheap labor and, in some cases, of subsidies. We will never decrease wages in this country. The standards of our workmen as to wages and treatment in the shipyards, on the ships, or on the docks we will never consent to lower. Neither will we adopt a policy of subsidizing the ships, although that of itself would be unavailing. Consequently, there is no other alternative but for the Government to intervene in such way as proposed in this bill.

Quite apart, even, from considerations of national defense, we owe it to the people of this country, out of reasonable regard for their welfare and for the prosperity of the Nation, to establish our own means of reaching the market places of the world. Otherwise, foreign ships will dominate our commerce, take such toll as they will, form trusts and combinations to suit themselves, give every advantage to our competitors, keep our goods out of markets to which they could profitably go, by raising freight rates, discriminate against us and in favor of our foreign competitors, destroy our trade by wretched service, delays, charges, hindrances, sorry vessels, irregular sailings, incurring losses for shippers, economizing at our expense, having no regard for the interests of our exporters, prompted by the single purpose of making all they can with as little benefit as possible to us, operating in the interest of manufacturers and merchants and producers of Europe, and making it impossible for us to develop and extend our commerce and business relations in quarters most desirable.

Our self-interest, as well as our self-respect, demands that such a situation shall cease. The short-sighted course, neglect, and prostration of the past must not be perpetuated. American ships are practically unknown in foreign lands. If our products are to continue to leave our shores any great length of time they will have to go with our flag. We have too much at stake in trusting our vast export business to foreign competitors. Every day millions of dollars' worth of our property go into merchantmen which are liable to be sunk by their foes.

Let me quote what Mr. GALLINGER very eloquently said in the Senate January 8, 1906:

FOR BROAD NATIONAL INTERESTS.

The plea of the Merchant Marine Commission, indorsed by the Committee on Commerce of this body, is not primarily for the shipowners or shipbuilders, or even for the seamen of this country, though all of these classes deserve at least as much consideration as is granted by our national laws to any other industrious and patriotic body of American citizens. The need of a large, active, and prosperous merchant fleet is primarily to increase our commerce, next to promote the national defense, and last of all to encourage shipbuilding and navigation. To deny adequate consideration to the merchant marine is to cheat the western or southern farmer of one of the surest hopes of an increased market for the products of his industry. It is to cheat the merchant and manufacturer of an indispensable ally in their fight for trade with their powerful European competitors.

Britain, France, and Germany, all make generous provision by national subvention for conveying not only their mails but their merchandise under their national flags to the distant neutral markets in which they and we are contending for the commercial mastery. Even the smaller powers—Spain, Italy, Austria, Portugal, and last, but not least, Japan—do the same thing. The United States alone leaves its merchants, manufacturers, and farmers at the edge of the ocean to get their goods over seas as best they may—by some accident of trade or the grace of their foreign rivals. If we lag in the world's markets, if we fall behind even in the Philippines, our own possessions, if we see Germany striding ahead of us in the Orient, and all Europe grasping

South America by commercial bonds stronger than the Monroe doctrine, the fault is our own, and in our own hands lies the remedy.

I refresh the Senator's recollection by calling his attention to those splendid remarks.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the Senator from Florida quote that part of a speech I made a good many years ago. I have repeated it a good many times since then, and I presume I may repeat it in the future. I have held to that view—that it was a national disgrace that we had not an adequate merchant marine. I have sounded the alarm, as the Senator has quoted to-day from the report of the Merchant Marine Commission, which I had the honor to write. I called attention to the fact that the time might arrive when we would not have any transportation for the products of our farms and our factories—the very condition that exists to-day.

While I differ very materially from the Senator in the view he takes of this question, I am glad to welcome him to the ranks of those of us who have labored in season and out of season to get some legislation that would benefit the American merchant marine, which has been very strenuously opposed by the Senator from Florida and his party.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator's statements, among which, as I recollect, was the statement that the American people would not establish an American merchant marine through subsidies. If I was correct in my understanding of what the Senator said, I should like to ask him upon what he bases that statement. Is it based upon the action of Congress in the past or is that simply the Senator's opinion as to what the American people really want?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to say, first, to the Senator from New Hampshire that I trust the day is now dawning when he can realize what he has hoped for for these many years.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a vain hope under this bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Utah, I will say that I base that statement upon our experience in the past and upon whatever pronouncement the people of this country have been able to make upon the subject, and at least in view of the fact that they have been unwilling for all these years to adopt any such policy as the granting of a subsidy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the last half hour I have been pinching myself to find out whether or not I was really asleep and dreaming. As I have listened to the Senator making his statements to-day, I have been wondering where I had heard them before. It seemed to me that I was back again in the year 1911 and that the Senator from New Hampshire had crossed to the other side of the Chamber and was speaking in the voice of the Senator from Florida.

I fully agree with all that the Senator has said of the necessity of an American merchant marine. I believe in a merchant marine, but I do not believe it will ever be established successfully as provided in this bill. If one is established, I say now that it will cost the American people three or four or five times as much as to pay a direct subsidy to the ships that would be owned by private parties.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I am not going to discuss the question of subsidies to-day; but I have been puzzled all through the years that have intervened since this question was up to be able to satisfy myself as to what a subsidy really is.

Under the statute that will be found now on the books, the ocean mail act of 1891, we are paying to American vessels something over a million dollars a year for the transportation of the mails. I have endeavored to get that amount slightly increased; and had it been slightly increased we would have had vessels in the over-seas trade to-day sufficient to take care of our commerce.

Mr. McAdoo, in a hearing before the House committee to which I shall call attention later on—because it does not amount to anything except that Mr. McAdoo occupied the time—admits that under this bill there will be a large loss to the people of the United States. He frankly says so. He is not sure, he says, that all the lines will be unremunerative, but he knows that most of them will be unremunerative. Now, we

are going to tax the American people for the difference. It is a subsidy, just as much as it would be if we took the money out of the Treasury and established ocean mail lines by aiding private parties in conducting them. I can not for the life of me see the difference between them.

Mr. FLETCHER. In one case, Mr. President, you are simply taxing the American people for the benefit of a few people engaged in a particular business or enterprise. In the other case you are taxing the American people for all the people and all the business of the country—in other words, for themselves.

The question of subsidies is quite a large one and has been extensively discussed in the past. I might mention in that connection, however, that we are now paying \$735,000 a year to one trans-Atlantic line for carrying our mails. We have paid subsidies to a Brazil line. Our experience in that connection has not been encouraging as far as building up a mercantile marine is concerned. We have generously contributed in that direction in the past. As the Senator has said, the act of 1891 provides for this enormous outlay for carrying the mails, far in excess of the actual cost, and it gives the preference to the American vessels over foreign vessels as to all second-class matter and third-class matter. Notwithstanding all we have paid out in that connection, however, we have not approached a solution of the problem of providing ships for doing our foreign trade, and I can see no hope that we can ever attain the object in that way. My claim is that for 50 years we have been unable to enlist sufficient interest on the part of private individuals so that they might build up a merchant marine in the foreign trade, although we have given them all these advantages, and even subsidies, in the past; we have discriminated in favor of them in our laws, particularly with reference to the carrying of mail; and yet we are no further advanced in that direction than we were 50 years ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida further yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish only to put in the Record at this point the fact that notwithstanding the subventions, as I call them, we are giving under the ocean mail act of 1891, the Government has an annual profit of over \$2,000,000 in the transportation of our mails; and heretofore I have argued that that profit might well be used to further strengthen our American lines and to give us an over-seas commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. In this connection it is fair also to say that out of the nearly \$3,000,000 we are now paying for carrying foreign mails more than one-half of it goes to foreign vessels.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; that is very true.

Mr. FLETCHER. The American vessels are not carrying half of the mails, in spite of the inducements we have offered.

Tonnage of the sailing and steam vessels of the merchant marine of the United States employed in foreign trade in 1887 was, gross tons, 989,412; in 1913, gross tons, 1,019,165, an increase of only 29,753 tons in 26 years, while our foreign commerce has increased by the hundred millions.

TRANSPORTS AND AUXILIARIES.

There is another phase of this question which brings to notice a very important factor to be seriously considered.

Independent of the commercial aspect, we must be impressed with the wisdom of a step like this now proposed for the purpose of providing, reasonably and economically, necessary means of national defense.

The General Board, Navy Department, by Admiral George Dewey, president of the General Board, made a report to the Secretary of the Navy, November 23, 1905, on the subject of "Mail steamships as naval auxiliaries." The General Staff, by Smith S. Leach, lieutenant colonel, General Staff, special committee, made a report to the Secretary of War, William H. Taft, December 22, 1905, on the subject of "The Army's need of merchant steamships as transports in war." These reports appear in Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session.

So far as I am advised the desirability, if not the public necessity, of providing for the naval auxiliaries and the Army transports pointed out in these reports exists to-day in even fuller measure than when the reports were made.

We may feel like making that provision in a different way from that suggested then, if any specific method may be regarded as favored then, but surely there is no less demand for its being done.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

About one-half the cost of our ocean mail service, amounting to \$3,565,328.89 annually, we pay to foreign ships. To some important countries no American ship ever goes. We are de-

pendent entirely upon foreign ships for our mail, freight, and passenger communications with Brazil and Argentina, two great countries, whose friendly relations we enjoy and with whom we could just as well as not have valuable and extensive commercial relations many times greater than we now have. The exception is the one American line from New York to Brazil.

The same is true with other Republics of South America.

Likewise, from our Atlantic seaboard to the Orient we have no ship carrying mails or freight while foreign ship combines control the traffic entirely.

The fast-mail carriers constitute powerful agencies for trade and valuable factors, especially for the country whose flag they fly.

It is highly important that we extend and improve our ocean mail service, which we can only do by increasing facilities. Notwithstanding we pay \$4 per mile to the European line, under American register, and the preference rates under the law whereby steamers of United States register not under contract receive 80 cents per pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents per pound for other articles, while steamers of foreign register and all sailing vessels receive about 35 cents per pound for letters and post cards and about 4½ cents per pound for other articles, "comparatively few American steamers are available for the dispatch of the mails, and the bulk of the service is performed by foreign steamers."

It is undisputed that American ships in foreign trade are wholly insufficient and inadequate. It ought to be conceded that it is most desirable and important that we increase the number of American merchantmen and train our citizens as officers and seamen to officer and man such ships. We are not willing to attempt this by giving public moneys for the support and maintenance of any private enterprise, even if that would be helpful in accomplishing the restoration of our prestige upon the seas. The grant of a subsidy to some special interest would be a discriminatory invasion of the Treasury the country would strongly disapprove, no matter if it resulted in more American ships, and properly so, on principle. It is admitted that it would be a great consummation to open up mail routes and give a better mail service to certain foreign countries. No one questions that reasonable foresight would dictate more ample provision for Army transports and Navy auxiliaries.

If these things be true, then it is simply a question of how to attain these desirable and, I venture to say, pressing ends.

It is fundamentally wrong and unjust to use the money of all the people in order that a few engaged in a particular business may get more profit.

The remedy, therefore, does not lie in granting subsidies, "subvention," nor "mail pay," nor "free ships," nor yet in "discriminating duties."

We now have laws providing for "free ships" and "discriminating duties," but they have brought but little addition to our foreign shipping facilities and clearly will not suffice to solve the problem, as we have seen.

The occasion has arisen when we are obliged to resort to other means. Circumstances not of our making at all have brought us face to face with the necessity of providing those means.

No country can prosper by living entirely to and within itself. In these days when cables steal out from our shores to the ports of all civilized countries; when communication can be flashed through the air like lightning a distance of 8,000 miles; when even not an unusual financial disturbance in one part of the world will have its effects here; when an earthquake or other disaster across the ocean is known around the world in a few hours; when, for instance, Dewey's achievement in Manila on Sunday morning was known in Washington the Saturday night before; when our surplus of farm produce and of mine and factory is in demand by other peoples, our neighbors, and it is in our power to take them from places where they are comparatively worthless to places where they have much value, we should exercise that power to our present advantage and for our future increasing benefit.

In doing that we bring to our people the things they want, to the advantage of those with whom we make exchange and to our own service; we broaden and widen our friendship by better acquaintance and clearer understandings; at the same time we help to shed the light of civilization and promote mightily the good of humanity.

We have the right and the power to purchase, build, lease, charter, and acquire the ships required to accomplish those ends. We may operate the ships or charter them to others, as may be determined to be best, under such conditions as will protect our people against excessive charges and prevent combines.

We owe it to ourselves to see that our own agents go to all countries wanting our goods, who will serve our interests rather than the interests of our competitors into whose hands we have hitherto intrusted our exports. The time has arrived for positive, definite, energetic action by the Government itself on behalf of all the people. This action should be prompt and effectual. The situation brooks of no delay. From all portions of the country and from all classes of our people the call is for immediate action by the Government. From every industry and every enterprise the call comes. From every individual who desires the prosperity of the country and the welfare of its citizens, the call is made. I believe there is patriotism enough, wisdom sufficient, and statesmanship ample to answer that call.

Mr. President, I desire, without reading, to attach to and make a part of my remarks a few letters and clippings which I have received.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, permission will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Chamber of Commerce, successor to Pensacola Commercial Association.]
PENSACOLA, FLA., December 19, 1914.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Last night I talked with the president of the Pensacola Tar & Turpentine Co., a corporation which produces turpentine, tar, pitch, and various by-products. "We have several thousand barrels of tar on our yards," he said. "We can sell every barrel at a good price in England and on the Continent. The ship brokers will offer us no space, and promise us none definitely. The last turpentine we shipped cost \$4 a barrel to deliver in England. This is 8 cents a gallon, four times the normal rate. For the last tar shipped to England we paid \$1.50 a barrel freight, deck load, and took our own risk, as the insurance asked was about 15 per cent. We know by heart now the cable-code words that mean 'Can not quote,' 'Unable to get ships.'"

The freight situation has almost killed the export lumber and timber business to England and Europe, the principal markets. The merchants have inquiries and could get business if they could get bottoms to carry it. If they are lucky enough to get a ship, they must pay double or triple freight and 1½ to 2 per cent extra war-risk insurance. They must prepay the freight also.

Ships can be had for cotton and grain, but at three and four times the normal rate. A ship broker told me yesterday he was asked \$3.25 a hundredweight freight to Germany. Rates are, by far, the highest known in the experience of ship brokers here.

The remedy for this situation is more neutral ships. Two conditions are the cause of our present European ocean-freight ills:

Decrease in number of vessels available—estimated at 30 to 40 per cent.

Uncertainty as to maintenance of the present supply, which may be reduced by destruction of vessels or their withdrawal from the uses of commerce for war purposes.

More ships would help remedy the first condition; neutral ships the second.

Very truly, yours,

C. E. DOBSON, President.

NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICAN TRADING CO.,
Louisville, Ky., December 16, 1914.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My not replying before this day to your esteemed letter of the 27th of November is due to my absence from Louisville.

I wish to thank you for the pamphlets which you have also sent me.

If you refer to the printed testimony given before the Merchant Marine Committee in the investigation of the foreign ship trust, you will find much information.

I appeared before said committee on January 7, 1913. Mr. Lowry, of the Pan American Mail—the New Orleans line—also testified at some length, giving much valuable information along practical and technical lines.

The sworn testimony of shippers and shipping experts before the Alexander committee indisputably proves that a conspiracy existed on the part of foreign shipping combinations to control America's over-sea commerce, so as to wring annual tribute from it and to checkmate the too ambitious efforts of the United States in expanding her foreign commerce.

The hearings before the committee show that there existed not a single American ship under the Stars and Stripes in the carrying trade between the United States, Brazil, and Argentina, and that all other lines known as American lines—operating ships under foreign flags—had certain routes allotted to them in the trade with the west coast of South and Central America.

These so-called American lines were members of the so-called conference lines, and all dominated by the foreign shipping trust, whose headquarters were London and Germany.

The investigation showed that the tariffs or freight rates from United States ports to foreign marts, notably to those of South America, were dictated from Europe, and were made so as to conserve the bulk of the flow of commerce from South America to Europe and vice versa.

The dividends declared by these foreign lines are sufficient denials of the statements that the American lines can't compete with European lines on a legitimate basis.

All that American lines need is protection against rebating and combinations or monopolies aimed at driving independent American lines off the seas.

To expand our commerce legitimately and to maintain and protect it, we need American lines under the American flag, operated by Americans, and protected by America.

I am inclosing copies of letters which treat of this subject, which I think point out the disadvantages under which our Nation labors and suggest the things we must do to emancipate ourselves from English and European economic domination.

I note that foreign sinister influences are still at work trying to obstruct and defeat the measures now before Congress that would aid in the upbuilding of our merchant shipping. The fact that America might again resume her former place among the nations as a maritime

power and carry her own trade is of greater concern to the nations of Europe—England, especially—than the present European struggle.

Europe's war might be over in a year or two and these European nations will then turn loose their shipping to resume the ocean trade routes and reconquer the markets that they temporarily lost, but an American merchant marine would be an obstacle to their ambitions.

Hoping to have the honor of again hearing from you, I beg to remain,

Very respectfully,

SIDNEY STORY.

[From the New York Press, December 19, 1914.]

OUR SHIPPING FOLLY.

On how slender a thread hangs to-day the foreign commerce of this country, though we are at peace with all the world, though we are abundantly supplied with surplus products that all the peoples of the earth, those at peace and those at war, need and ask for, may be appreciated by anybody who reflects upon the possibilities suggested by the raid of the flying squadron of German cruisers against the Yorkshire coast.

Not that anything like that could imperil the safety of, or even do more than negligible damage to, Great Britain. Not that such a thing could hasten or retard the end of the war in favor of one side or the other.

It is not that the German cruisers came flying out against the Yorkshire coast, but that they came out with all the seas before them.

We are doing a vast export business. For the most part our many cargoes of products are going out in English bottoms. Almost between the rising and the setting of the sun of every day we are selling abroad by the tens of millions, and we are making profits by the millions. And almost all of this depends upon the British merchantmen that are free to carry our cargoes over all the waters of the earth so long as German battleships, cruisers, and commerce destroyers are not ranging those waters in fleets, as the solitary *Emden* ranged in the East to the terror of merchant shipping, and as the *Karlsruhe* has similarly ranged in the South Atlantic waters of the West.

A score of *Emdens* scattered over the seas might all be doomed to be run down sooner or later, but in the meanwhile they might very well sweep the oceans clear of the British merchant marine, as England's war fleet have swept the oceans clear of Germany's merchant marine.

And that would be the end of our foreign commerce. We should have the wheat, the corn, the cotton, the thousand and one supplies now going out every day in heavily freighted ships; the peoples of the world, neutrals and belligerents, would be begging for our neutral products, but we could not ship them, for, though a neutral nation, we should lack neutral ships.

Neutral commerce is helpless to transport itself in anything but neutral ships if sea powers at war against each other can both maintain fleets on the high seas.

We ought to have our own neutral ships, just as we have our own neutral articles of commerce, and then all the fleets of commerce of all the belligerents might vanish off the seas, and we could trade with no hindrance. Not only could we sail our commerce into the ports of neutrals, but when there was no contraband goods in the cargoes we could sail them past the forts and under the guns into all the ports of all the powers at war.

And we, aiming to be the greatest trading Nation on earth, to all intents and purposes, haven't a ship. This is an economic folly, a national shame.

[From the New York Press, December 19, 1914.]

FARMERS LOSE THROUGH DISCRIMINATION BY BIG STEAMSHIP INTERESTS—FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO ENCOURAGE MERCHANT MARINE FACTOR AGAINST EXPORTERS, SAYS W. N. WHITE.

American farmers and exporters are losing millions of dollars as a direct result of discrimination against this country by steamship interests. That, in substance, is the assertion made to Congress and other branches and departments of the Government by W. N. White, of W. N. White & Co., of this city. Discrimination is made possible by the failure of the United States Government to encourage the American merchant marine.

This year's crop of apples should realize for the growers about \$250,000,000, White estimates. "It will not pay them \$50,000,000, and unless something is done soon 650,000 acres of orchards in the far West will be put out of business."

Thousands of growers who set out from 10 to 20 acre orchards of apples, believing that would enable them and their families to have a competency for life, will be ruined, and not only lose their savings but their homes as well.

Similar losses will be suffered by growers of other fruits. Discrimination, White says, takes the form of high ocean freight rates. Comparisons of rates were submitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

EXTORTIONATE RATES.

The chairman of that committee, JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER, refers to the ocean freight rates now being charged to ports in Europe as "extortionate."

"If you wish to ship oranges to Europe," White explains, "the ocean freight rate is 50 cents a box. The same sized box of oranges can be shipped from Jaffa, by way of Alexandria, Egypt, to Liverpool for 42 cents. That voyage ordinarily requires 23 days. The rate from Spain to Liverpool is only 18 cents a box."

"The rate for apples to Norway and Sweden—a trip of about 12 days—is \$1.50 and \$2 a barrel. To South America—a trip of 23 days—the rate is \$4.25 a barrel."

"It costs \$1.10 a box to send apples from New York to South America, the time required being from 21 to 25 days. On the other hand, freight charges on box apples from Tasmania to England—time in transit, 42 days—is 66 cents, and the same rate is charged from Australia to England—time, 35 days."

"The reason those rates are so much cheaper than ours is they have plenty of ships."

"The Furness Line, from Montreal to South Africa—35 days' run—charges 72 cents a box and \$2.38 a barrel. Those vessels are subsidized by the Canadian Government. There are no steamships direct from the United States to South Africa. The American must ship first to England and then transship to South Africa, which costs more than double the freight charged from Montreal."

From these and other illustrations White concludes that this country can not hope to extend its commerce properly without the aid of a large American merchant marine.

SURPLUS FOR EUROPE.

"Plenty of people in America say we will send our surplus to Europe. 'They must have it.' They might take the surplus if the rate of freight were the same as charged from other ports, and the freight would be the same were it not for the steamship combination."

"The steamship agents here say the freight rates are fixed in Europe, but that is a subterfuge. It is a well-known fact that the agents for various companies meet in the Produce Exchange in New York between the hours of 1 and 3 p. m. and there compare their offerings and bookings made for steamers a week in advance. If their ships are well laden, no reductions in freight rates are made, and if they have demands for more space than they can supply they increase the rates."

Millions of dollars of products are being wasted to-day because of inability of farmers to reach foreign markets. In Florida, for instance, many owners of orchards are permitting the fruits to rot on the trees because they can see no profit in trying to sell them.

White says there are 8,000,000 boxes of oranges in Florida and almost 18,000,000 boxes in California. When the season commenced recently Florida oranges were selling at an average of \$1.50 a box gross. From that must be deducted 56 cents freight, 15 cents for the box, 13 cents for paper and packing, and about 13 cents more for cost of picking and hauling to the warehouse.

"After Christmas plenty of oranges will be sold for freight and expenses alone."

With adequate shipping facilities and consequent lower ocean freight rates the surplus fruit could be shipped profitably to European, South African, and South American markets.

CHANCE FOR ONIONS.

"This year there is a large crop of onions in the United States," says White, "and with reasonable freight rates quite a quantity could be exported to England and Scotland. The first shipments that were sent paid 30 shillings a ton freight. Now the rate is 40 shillings."

"Every year quantities of onions are shipped here from Egypt on through bills of lading, and the freight charge on these shipments is only 30 shillings a ton. The time of passage from Egypt to Liverpool is 16 days, and from Liverpool to New York 10 days, which includes the time consumed in unloading and reloading on the Liverpool piers."

"The rate from Liverpool to New York is 20 shillings, but to ship the same goods from New York to Liverpool the charge is 40 shillings. The consequence of this unjust rate is that onions must be sacrificed."

"I can not think that the Ship Trust owns America. To fail to encourage an American merchant marine is to encourage the Ship Trust. If the Canadian Government can afford subsidies at the rate of more than \$2,000,000 in a year in order to protect its farmers, surely the United States should increase its shipping facilities by subsidies or in some other way. Otherwise, thousands of acres of land will cease to be cultivated."

[From the Washington Times, December 26, 1914.]

HIGH SHIPPING RATES.

The first cargo of cotton to leave an American port direct for Germany since the war opened put out from Galveston yesterday, consisting of 6,500 bales, going to Bremen. Under the agreement reached a few weeks ago it will go without opposition or blockade right into its port through the British fleet, for cotton is not contraband when carried in neutral bottoms.

Entirely aside from the importance of resuming the export of cotton to Germany interest attaches to this shipment because of the freight rate on it. The owners of the cotton will pay, despite that it is not a war risk, \$3 per 100 pounds, whereas a year ago the charge would have been just about 10 per cent of that rate.

The reason is said to be the scarcity of shipping to handle the business of the world. The German merchant marine has been driven off the seas, and it was highly important as a transportation factor. Many ships have been captured and destroyed. Probably a very much larger number yet have been commandeered for service as transports, auxiliaries of all kinds, colliers, and the like.

Yet all this can hardly justify such a huge advance in ocean freights as is being demanded. Back of all the war-time conditions there is the fact that absolutely no stability governs ocean carriage charges. Rates run all the way from zero—the carriage of heavy cargo free in order to get its use as ballast—to figures which even in normal times are often excessive. The whole subject has been the theme of numerous complaints and is now under investigation by the Treasury Department. David Lubin, American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, made a detailed and most impressive statement of these conditions to a congressional committee a few months ago. The Senate has called for information from the administrative departments of the Government, and it appears there is hope for some effective measures to better conditions.

The measures are needed. Whether or no, the Government will find itself landed right in the business of building or buying ships, and perhaps operating them on Government account for commercial purposes, unless some measure of order can be brought out of the chaos of water-transportation conditions.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 21st instant, you are informed as follows:

The reason why more is paid to foreign steamers than to American steamers for the conveyance of the mails is that comparatively few American steamers are available for the dispatch of the mails, and that the bulk of the service is performed by foreign steamers. For instance, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, 979,002 pounds of letters and post cards and 7,827,593 pounds of other articles were dispatched by American steamers, and 2,554,066 pounds of letters and post cards and 14,014,849 pounds of other articles were dispatched by foreign steamers.

The only steamship lines under formal contract with the department for the conveyance of mails to foreign countries are those operating under the act of March 3, 1891. These lines are paid on the basis of the distance traveled on the outward trips, and are as follows: Red D Line, from New York to Venezuela via Porto Rico and Curacao, once every two weeks in vessels of the third class, compensation \$1 a mile. Red D Line, from New York to Venezuela via Porto Rico and Curacao, once every two weeks in vessels of the fourth class, compensation 66½ cents a mile. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., from

New York to Vera Cruz, Mexico, via Havana and Progreso, once a week in vessels of the third class, compensation \$1 a mile. The International Mercantile Marine Co., from New York to Southampton via Plymouth and Cherbourg, once a week in vessels of the first class, compensation \$4 a mile. Oceanic Steamship Co., from San Francisco to Sydney, Australia, via Honolulu and Pago Pago, once every four weeks in vessels of the second class, compensation \$2 a mile.

Steamers other than those operating under the act of 1891 are compensated on the basis of the actual weights of the mails conveyed, the rates at present allowed being 80 cents a pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents a pound for other articles to steamers of American register, and 4 francs a kilogram (about 35 cents a pound) for letters and post cards and 50 centimes a kilogram (about 4½ cents a pound) for other articles to steamers of foreign register.

The tables on pages 103 to 106, inclusive, of the report of this office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, show in detail the name of each line used for the conveyance of the mails for that year, the weight of the mails conveyed by each line, and the amount of the compensation paid to each line. Said tables indicate also whether the steamers of each line are of American or foreign register.

Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, December 18, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your request by telephone to be furnished with the amounts paid to American steamers and foreign steamers, respectively, for the conveyance of United States mails to foreign countries for each fiscal year from 1909 to 1914, inclusive, I have the honor to furnish below a statement in confirmation of the data furnished to you by the superintendent of foreign mails early this afternoon by telephone.

Amount paid.

	American steamers.	Foreign steamers.
Fiscal year ended June 30—		
1909.....	\$1,354,996.18	\$919,075.62
1910.....	1,359,513.21	1,015,696.44
1911.....	1,321,418.81	1,140,455.46
1912.....	1,289,787.70	1,295,231.49
1913.....	1,453,212.18	1,325,344.21
1914.....	1,409,483.77	1,429,434.25

Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 29, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of the 26th instant, quoting a statement in Senate Document 425, Sixty-first Congress, second session, and your inquiries based on that document, I call your attention to the following facts:

1. From 1893 until September, 1913, no American steamships were running regularly between ports of the United States and Brazil, but about September, 1913, the United States & Brazil Steamship Line was organized, making use of ships of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., with sailings of about once a month or once in three weeks from New York to Rio de Janeiro and other Brazilian ports. I inclose an advertisement of the line from the New York Journal of Commerce of December 28. Since the passage of the ship registry act of August 18, 1914, a number of steamers have taken out American registers for South American trade, principally ships owned by the United States Steel Products Co.

2. From 1893 up to date, so far as I am aware, there has been no regular American steamship service to Argentina.

3. The American people have been dependent on foreign steamships for their mail, freight, and passenger communications with Brazil and Argentina. This condition continued from 1893 to date, except as indicated above.

4. The following steamers ply regularly between our Pacific seaboard and the Orient:

	Gross tons.
Minnesota.....	20,718
Manchuria.....	13,639
Mongolia.....	13,639
Siberia.....	11,284
Korea.....	11,276
China.....	5,060

(NOTE.—Army transports, of course, do a considerable Government business between Pacific coast ports and Honolulu and the Philippines.)

5. I know of no American steamships plying regularly between our Atlantic seaboard and the Orient.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 30, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with your request of December 21, I take pleasure in inclosing herewith a statement showing the exports of the principal articles from the United States to Brazil during the last three fiscal years ending June 30, 1912 to 1914, inclusive.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, Secretary.

Exports of the principal articles from the United States to Brazil during the last three fiscal years ending June 30, 1912 to 1914, inclusive.

Articles.	Quantities.		Values.		1914	
	1912	1913	1912	1913	Quantities.	Values.
Domestic exports:						
Agricultural implements, and parts of.....			\$426,124	\$324,823		\$231,698
Blacking.....			31,464	38,502		25,235
Breadstuffs—						
Wheat flour..... barrels..	625,399	583,418	3,277,981	3,105,239	748,612	3,752,105
All other.....			75,916	48,161		34,333
Cars, carriages, other vehicles, and parts of—						
Automobiles..... number..	554	1,023	662,883	1,110,320	312	285,441
Cars, passenger and freight.....			1,243,293	3,754,065		793,604
Cycles and motor cycles, and parts of.....			17,596	32,191		26,092
All other.....			135,596	339,579		225,745
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines—						
Medicines, patent or proprietary.....			387,554	404,344		248,617
All other.....			251,949	184,633		141,510
Clocks and watches, and parts of.....			124,611	120,025		66,015
Coal—bituminous..... tons..	307,125	234,368	1,025,646	727,341	239,082	766,824
Copper, manufactures of.....			405,223	410,784		133,110
Cotton, manufactures of—						
Cloths—						
Bleached and unbleached..... yards..	384,799	307,559	50,981	54,747	162,132	35,849
Colored..... yards..	889,195	828,183	66,844	65,300	404,904	36,556
All other.....			190,887	266,321		156,857
Dental goods.....			159,815	228,422		174,550
Electrical machinery, appliances, and instruments.....			3,252,666	3,040,465		2,204,763
Explosives—						
Cartridges.....			371,771	477,349		287,600
All other.....			30,523	10,019		18,561
Fibers, vegetable, and textile grasses, manufactures of—						
Twine.....			54,959	82,440		60,634
All other.....			31,520	36,091		32,923
Fish—						
Salmon, canned..... pounds..	151,717	219,492	17,348	22,820	80,129	7,211
Shellfish.....			72,060	91,943		43,762
All other.....			73,958	129,715		54,308
Fruits and nuts.....			163,990	163,134		348,360
Glass and glassware.....			93,317	93,591		70,492
Gold and silver, manufactures of, including jewelry.....			57,561	41,487		26,634
India rubber, manufactures of.....			199,239	251,290		119,272
Instruments and apparatus for scientific purposes.....			103,661	111,385		57,057
Iron and steel, and manufactures of—						
Builders' hardware.....			247,553	236,427		173,808
Cutlery.....			98,798	108,309		85,329
Firearms.....			515,323	587,933		362,647
Machinery, machines, and parts of—						
Cash registers..... number..	1,246	2,627	188,574	364,644	1,153	150,267
Engines, and parts of—						
Locomotives..... number..	92	211	1,251,824	2,317,853	66	637,528
All other, and parts of.....			440,490	523,949		344,019
Metal-working machinery.....			231,422	346,187		115,974
Mining machinery.....			236,128	285,119		111,693
Printing presses.....			17,607	100,186		38,201
Sewing machines.....			1,011,264	1,677,141		1,611,510
Typewriting machines.....			312,638	351,640		125,598
Woodworking machinery.....			116,761	120,896		34,120
All other machinery, and parts of.....			1,205,027	1,444,026		1,100,157
Nails and spikes..... lbs..	2,762,550	2,257,350	65,852	58,492	1,330,278	38,158
Pipes and fittings..... lbs..	8,229,676	9,637,859	243,374	374,455	4,239,556	144,135
Rails for railways, of steel..... tons..	40,730	31,629	1,187,462	1,031,884	45,367	1,529,309
Tools, n. e. s.....			620,361	938,001		541,005
Structural iron and steel..... tons..	3,958	9,610	246,763	467,922	2,780	163,641
Wire..... lbs..	32,824,320	37,095,991	825,264	902,327	28,375,955	648,180
All other iron and steel.....			1,729,350	1,564,633		1,033,105
Lamps, chandeliers, etc. (except electric).....			73,873	59,500		43,107
Leather and tanned skins, and manufactures of—						
Leather and tanned skins—						
Upper.....			483,336	651,024		357,943
All other.....			99,744	246,249		186,218
Manufactures of—						
Boots and shoes..... pairs..	85,342	160,267	234,817	485,608	143,497	451,628
All other.....			27,647	22,888		12,207
Meat and dairy products—						
Bacon..... lbs..	958,879	1,150,561	122,995	169,128	870,390	130,502
Pork, pickled..... lbs..	168,415	3,489	16,635	482		
Lard..... lbs..	601,349	603,537	73,854	79,837	651,963	86,377
Butter..... lbs..	598	241	120	47		
All other.....			44,451	33,210		12,491
Naval stores—						
Rosin..... barrels..	176,964	180,701	1,165,573	1,212,539	97,658	673,687
Turpentine, spirits of..... gallons..	334,240	356,652	188,503	176,324	301,912	154,288
Oils—						
Animal—						
Lard..... gallons..	3,411	2,610	2,832	2,376	2,315	2,216
All other..... gallons..	1,030	498	962	249	200	203
Mineral, refined—						
Illuminating..... gallons..	37,491,101	32,828,176	3,092,334	2,837,707	32,275,552	3,231,668
Lubricating..... gallons..	2,740,496	3,403,672	530,217	723,586	3,181,624	659,352
All other..... gallons..	5,137,719	8,518,771	718,626	1,376,207	8,056,074	1,367,943
Vegetable—						
Cottonseed..... pounds..	3,016,045	3,500,660	192,500	239,275	2,566,670	191,781
All other.....			2,868	4,929		6,502
Paints, pigments, colors, and varnishes.....			149,397	240,074		126,019
Paper, and manufactures of—						
Books, maps, engravings, etc.....			166,584	280,304		227,866
Printing paper..... pounds..	126,306	346,898	6,511	11,735	326,335	10,071
All other.....			82,657	86,391		77,927
Paraffin and paraffin wax.....			8,640	11,939	555,663	18,498
Perfumes, cosmetics, and all toilet preparations.....			17,779	21,392		15,818
Plated ware.....			25,123	46,215		24,910
Silk, manufactures of.....			15,957	7,927		6,502
Soap.....			36,757	49,754		41,050
Spirits, etc.—Malt liquors.....			12	396		331
Vegetables.....			53,796	40,302		42,306

Exports of the principal articles from the United States to Brazil, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Quantities.		Values.		1914	
	1912	1913	1912	1913	Quantities.	Values.
Domestic exports—Continued.						
Wood, manufactures of—						
Timber, sawed.....M feet..	747	853	\$17,485	\$18,755	331	\$7,565
Lumber.....M feet..	59,643	69,823	1,248,665	1,564,141	38,023	913,982
Boards, planks, deals, joists, and scantling.....M feet..			27,226	75,069		12,682
All other.....			148,395	112,274		138,106
Furniture.....			77,644	65,350		34,095
All other manufactures of.....			1,380,394	2,020,721		1,123,100
All other articles.....						
Total domestic exports.....			34,587,050	42,542,424		29,843,018
Total foreign exports.....			91,031	96,043		120,896
Total exports of merchandise.....			34,678,081	42,638,467		29,963,914

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, December 24, 1914.]

THE SHIPPING SITUATION.

The shipping interests of the United States—the builders and operators of steamships—are paralyzed on account of the uncertainty that hangs over their business. They do not know whether or not the Government is to enter the field as their competitor. They do not know whether or not foreign-built ships will be permitted to enter the coastwise trade. They do not know whether or not the Government will protect them against unjustified aggression by belligerents.

Ocean freight rates have jumped skyward since the beginning of the war. German and Austrian vessels have been laid up; British vessels have been largely commandeered by the Government; Italian vessels are engaged in Government service; French vessels are almost wholly employed by the French Government. Hence the world's neutral commerce, and much of the commerce with belligerents, is carried on with a shortage of ships just at a moment when the demand for supplies is most urgent. Vessels are earning five times as much as before the war, and even when the war is ended the prospect is good for an enormous ocean commerce on account of the destruction and consumption of foodstuffs and supplies of all kinds.

Is it to be supposed that Americans are not wide awake to this opportunity? The shipping men and shipbuilders are not asleep. They would build ships and put them into this immensely profitable business if they knew they were safe. But they dare not order vessels to be constructed in American shipyards if cheaper foreign ships are to be admitted into the coastwise trade. They dare not build ships for the foreign trade while they are threatened with the competition of the Government itself. The best they can do is to meet the huge demands of Europe by chartering foreign vessels and sending them out with American cargoes. They are doing a big business and making a lot of money, but the traffic is not bringing about the construction of a single vessel in American yards.

One of the most urgent questions before Congress is the Government shipping bill. It needs quick and thorough discussion. If it is a good plan it should be put through without delay. If it is unwise it should be promptly rejected in order that individual American enterprise may go ahead and build ships.

[From the Florida Times-Union, December 31, 1914.]

USING GERMANY'S EXCUSE.

As a rule the London papers whose opinions of the Wilson note have been quoted by the Associated Press do not claim that Great Britain has been acting within her rights in interfering with American shipping on the high seas, but justify it on the ground of necessity. On precisely the same ground Germany justified her invasion of Belgium. She promised to go through Belgium with as little damage as possible and pay the proper indemnity, just as Great Britain promises to hold American vessels as short a time as possible and pay the proper indemnity. But Belgium as a neutral refused to listen to the German plea of necessity. She would have ceased to be neutral if she had listened, and we should refuse to listen to the British plea of necessity. If we surrender our rights in order that Great Britain and her allies may be able to whip Germany and Austria, our neutrality is a sham. If we are neutral, we are not concerned with Great Britain's necessities. Individuals in this country sympathize with the allies and others with the two Teutonic nations, but the United States as a Nation does not give a continental which side whips. That is what neutrality means. But the United States as a Nation falls contemptibly short of its duty if it does not protect its citizens in their rights, and the fact that it has not done so has already cost the South alone hundreds of millions of dollars, not in the cargoes seized, but because the fear of seizure has paralyzed our commerce.

This damage will never be paid. Great Britain may pay damages amounting to a million or two dollars for the detention of ships, and in some cases to the confiscation of cargoes, but the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of products that Europe would take from us at a good price if we would deliver them and that have been withheld through fear of capture by the British—this inflicts enormous damage for which payment will not be made.

If Americans are scared away from shipping cotton to Germany throughout the war, this of itself would reduce or rather has reduced the price at least \$10 per bale—a loss to American growers of \$160,000,000, and a gain to British spinners of \$50,000,000 on the 5,000,000 bales they buy. It is announced that cotton is not contraband, but it is also known that ships containing noncontraband cargoes have been seized, detained, and searched for contraband. This is a thing that our Government should not tolerate, and not one other American ship would be seized if it were known that our Government would not tolerate it.

GREAT BRITAIN HAS LOST SHIPS WORTH \$11,400,000—54 VESSELS WITH CARGOES VALUED AT \$18,800,000 CAPTURED OR DESTROYED BY THE ENEMY.

LONDON, December 18.

During the first four months of the war 54 British foreign-going ships, valued at \$11,400,000, with cargoes worth \$18,800,000, were cap-

tured or destroyed by the enemy. These are the official figures of the Liverpool and London War Risks Insurance Association.

According to these figures the losses for four months were 1.23 per cent of the total number of vessels, 1.49 per cent of their total value, and 0.94 per cent of the total value of cargoes carried.

This would indicate that vessels could have been insured at a rate of 0.37 per cent monthly, and their cargoes at a rate of 0.94. The rates fixed by the Government at the beginning of the war were 0.72 for vessels and 1.24 for cargoes. This shows a snug margin of profit for underwriters.

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, December 18.

Total losses to Scandinavian shipping through mine disasters were as follows up to mid-December:

Sweden, 8 ships and 60 lives; Denmark, 6 vessels and 6 lives; Norway, 5 vessels and 6 lives. To this total must also be added Holland, with 3 vessels and 15 lives. The total financial loss for the 22 ships and their cargoes will reach nearly \$10,000,000.

328 SANFORD AVENUE,
Flushing, N. Y., December 31, 1914.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My father, brother, and myself having been large owners in, and practical and successful managers of, United States sailing seagoing ships half a century ago, I am naturally much interested in the condition, suddenly discovered by our Congressmen, that we have very few strictly United States seagoing vessels.

For 10 years past I have written letters to our several Presidents explaining how, in the nature of things, there can be no revival of what our "rocking-chair sailors" please to call the "merchant marine."

From early times until, say, 1865, United States seagoing vessels were built in the United States of wood and propelled by canvas. When iron steam-propelled vessels gradually came into use, wooden sailing vessels went out, and will never be revived. In early days our seagoing vessels were of small tonnage; the crews were mostly United States citizens; and the captain was usually a part owner of the vessel under his command.

This has all been superseded by gigantic steam vessels owned by powerful foreign corporations, utterly inefficient seamen, as in the *Titanic* case, and the captains, largely of foreign birth, having no personal ownership in the vessel, merely hired to run the vessel as quickly as possible from one port to another, just as with the engine driver on a railroad train.

Millions of foreign capital is invested in our trans-Atlantic steam lines, and the excessive cost of a first-class steel ocean steamer built in this country offers no attraction to domestic capital.

Young men, members of well-to-do families, often "went to sea," something now unheard of except in naval circles. Appreciating from sad experience the foregoing conditions, I have proposed to Washington officials a practical method for securing at once a number of seagoing steam vessels to serve two purposes, viz, as colliers, absolutely necessary if our present or enlarged Navy is to be of any value; secondly, these vessels, say, of 10,000 tons each with a speed of 15 knots, to be plainly fitted for passengers and freight, and to be chartered to established, responsible United States firms engaged in shipping. Charters to provide for the return of the vessels when needed for Government service. Charterers to keep vessels and machinery in order at their own expense, and to maintain on each vessel, free of expense to the United States, a United States naval and engineer officer with full access at all times to all parts of vessels.

The charter money should more than pay interest on amount invested in vessels, and if eventually sold to charterers or other United States citizens, proceeds could be used in building other similar vessels. By this means lines could be established through the Panama Canal to South American ports by capable shipping merchants, who would not have enough available capital to build such vessels, and eventually, if profitable, private capital would be invested. Heretofore large amounts of the public money has been used in aid of railroads, irrigation, and sundry agricultural requirements, but none, as I can remember, for increase of United States shipping, although the United States has an immense extent of available seacoast with safe harbors. In my time the Swedes, French, Italians, and Germans have gradually but thoroughly supplanted us in ocean transportation.

If the foregoing suggestion does not meet approval, then the only hope for recovering our seagoing ascendancy is to abrogate all sumptuary maritime laws and allow our citizens to purchase vessels wherever built, with all the advantages given to vessels built in United States. Citizens of all other maritime nations have this privilege.

Silver-tongued orators armed with statistics may claim that we can build and operate first-class vessels in this country as cheaply as any other nation, but I and hundreds of other men educated as shipping merchants, but obliged to sell out and find other occupations, are living (or dead) refutations of this claim.

Trusting that your efforts to restore our ocean trade may be successful, and wishing you success in the new year, I remain,
Yours, truly,

ALFRED NELSON.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida if he will not consent to have the bill laid aside temporarily in order to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill? I ask unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing to have that done, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 20241, known as the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have requested unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum. There are Senators absent who are interested in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lippitt	Sheppard
Bankhead	Gallinger	Lodge	Shively
Borah	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bryan	Gronna	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Camden	Hardwick	Overman	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson	Page	Thornton
Clapp	Jones	Perkins	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Ransdell	White
	Lane	Shafroth	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. STERLING, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WORKS answered to their names when called.

Mr. OLIVER. My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is absent from the Senate to-day on account of illness.

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. STONE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I understand unanimous consent has been given to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent has been given to lay aside the shipping bill. Unanimous consent has not been given to take up the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up House bill 20241, known as the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. I object, Mr. President. Let the bill be taken up on motion.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move to take up House bill 20241.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20241) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the committee amendments will be considered first. The Chair hears no objection. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Collecting internal revenue," on page 2, line 22, after the date "1915,"

to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$180,000," so as to make the clause read:

For salaries and expenses of collectors of internal revenue, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, \$180,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

Improving Fourteenth Street: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to increase the width of roadway of Fourteenth Street NW., between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, to 70 feet, and to replace the present granite block pavement on said roadway with asphalt or asphalt block, chargeable to the appropriation for "Repairs to streets, avenues, and alleys," for the fiscal year 1915.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, \$554,371.24.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that paragraph may go over for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the request of the Senator from Utah will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The reading was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 5, line 22, after the word "means," to strike out "in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and," so as to make the clause read:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as may in his judgment be necessary, \$35,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay such expense and employ such persons and means to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, my attention was just called to this amendment. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina I do not believe the amendment is in the shape intended by the committee. I call his attention to the fact that if the amendment is adopted as proposed now, it will be impossible to employ persons or means either in the city of Washington or elsewhere. The amendment ought to read:

To pay such expense and employ such persons and means elsewhere than at the city of Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what the law is. I understand the words "in the city of Washington" were put in in order that they might establish a bureau in the city of Washington. So if we do not include those words they are bound to use the fund outside the city of Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not quite catch my meaning. I am in full sympathy with the Senator in striking out the words "in the city of Washington," because I do not believe persons affected by this appropriation ought to be employed in this city, but we go further in the amendment and strike out the words "and elsewhere," so that if all the words proposed are stricken out persons can not be employed in the city of Washington or elsewhere.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Utah allow me a moment? If you strike out the words as proposed by the committee the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to employ these persons and spend the money anywhere he pleases. It becomes perfectly general then.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me it leaves it perfectly general. When the words "in the city of Washington and elsewhere" are stricken out it does not necessarily exclude the employment elsewhere, but it strikes out the word "elsewhere" in the connection where the words "the city of Washington" are used.

Mr. SMOOT. As I understood the committee, it wanted to limit the expenditure of the appropriation to places other than the city of Washington.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That was the voice of the committee. I have no doubt about that; and this language does that very thing. It gives the discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture to employ such persons and means elsewhere and to cooperate with the authorities of the States concerned.

Mr. LODGE. That would not prevent him from using them in the city of Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. The whole appropriation could be used in the city of Washington.

Mr. LODGE. It would leave his power perfectly unlimited.

Mr. OVERMAN. The act of 1882 required the city of Washington to be specified for employment here.

Mr. LODGE. If I may make a suggestion, if you want to make it safe to obtain your purpose, you should say "and employ such persons and means except in the city of Washington."

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call attention to another portion of the bill. For instance, the very first item, "for the Civil Service Commission," reads:

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, \$6,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The language is there. I do not know that it does any harm.

Mr. SMOOT. As I am opposed to the provision anyway, I am perfectly satisfied to let it go; but the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House called my attention to it. I do not care whether the amendment is made or not.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is a matter the conference can adjust; but here is the law of 1882, which provides that—

No civil officer, clerk, draftsman, copyist, messenger, assistant messenger, mechanic, watchman, laborer, or other employee shall hereafter be employed at the seat of government in any executive department or subordinate bureau or office thereof, or be paid from any appropriation made for contingent expenses, or for any specific or general purpose, unless—

This is the general law—

such employment is authorized and payment therefor specifically provided in the law granting the appropriation.

So unless Congress specifically provides for using it in Washington it can not be used in Washington under the general law.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say as to that. My attention had not been called to it before, but I think that with these words stricken out they can spend this appropriation anywhere they wish, including the city of Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. Except in Washington City under the general law.

Mr. SMOOT. Again, I want to say that this is an urgent deficiency bill. We are appropriating here \$35,000 that is not a deficiency at all. The Government of the United States is not obligated for the payment of one cent of it. The appropriation belongs in an Agricultural appropriation bill, if it goes into any bill at all. The reason given by the Senators from Florida, in the first place, is that the money must be appropriated immediately, if the Government is going to appropriate any at all, so that the work can be begun at once. I have no doubt the citrus canker is a very dangerous disease to citrus trees. I have no doubt about that, nor would I object to the appropriation if it came in the regular way; but I do not believe that we ought to make on an urgent deficiency appropriation bill an appropriation which is not a deficiency in any sense of the word. The Government is not obligated, as I said, for one cent of the amount. This is simply giving \$35,000 to assist the people of Florida to eradicate, if possible, the disease known as the citrus canker.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it is scarcely fair to say that this appropriation is confined to taking care of the situation in Florida. The citrus canker was brought from Japan, it is supposed, into Mexico, and from Mexico into Texas, and from Texas it has gone along the Gulf. The States particularly suffering now are Louisiana, Mississippi, a portion of Alabama, and Florida, States where citrus fruits are grown, and those States are now confronted with the worst menace that has ever befallen the industry. Very largely Florida is interested. The trees which seem to be worst stricken by it are the grapefruit trees, and over \$200,000,000 have been invested by the people of Florida in grapefruit alone.

It is a disease which is very infectious, and the department says the only treatment for it is absolute eradication. They have not been able to find whether it is a fungous growth or whether it is of germ origin or what it is. The only thing they know is that it is destructive of the tree and the fruit, and the method of disposing of it at present is to set fire to the tree and burn it up. The growers of Florida raised a large fund, and they are cooperating with the Government. The Government is investigating the question as to how to treat the disease, its origin, its nature, and its effects.

This appropriation is in direct line with the activities of the Government under the Bureau of Plant Industry. It is an emergency in that the time for eradicating the disease must be in the months of January, February, and March. Three months of the year covers the time when this action must be taken if we are going to eradicate the disease.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was called out of the Chamber, and I did not hear the statement made about this item. Does this disease affect peach trees?

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not. It affects only citrus fruit trees.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course it is not in any proper sense an urgent deficiency, but apparently it is a pretty serious matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. It certainly is urgent. If it is not a deficiency, it is urgent.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have only one added observation to make about it, and that is I fear it is a subsidy.

Mr. FLETCHER. This item of \$35,000 is a very small item and the department ought to have it in hand. A part of it, I take, has already been expended. I think it comes more or less within the technical requirements of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from New Hampshire. Indeed, I know that the department sent agents down there, and they have been for some weeks investigating the disease and doing what they could to ascertain its location and the best methods of treating it.

I have not any doubt that a portion of the money has already been spent, and in view of that phase of it it is a deficiency. It certainly is urgent. The disease is not confined entirely to Florida. The department says:

Though the disease has been under investigation in the States of Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana during the past year, no means of prevention or control through the use of fungicides or other spray applications has yet been developed, the treatments found effective for most fungous diseases of plants having failed to control citrus canker.

The only method of control which appeared to be effective is the complete eradication of the disease from those regions most likely to suffer severely by its continuous presence through the destruction by burning of all infected nursery stock and of all infected trees in citrus groves.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How long has this insect or microbe or whatever it is been known? When was it first discovered in Florida, and to what extent has it been eradicated?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have found that it was probably brought into the State through some nursery stock imported about a year ago.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It has been brought there very recently?

Mr. FLETCHER. Very recently. They have traced it to certain nursery stock, and wherever that stock was sold throughout the States this disease has developed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has it spread over the State very largely, or is it sporadic?

Mr. FLETCHER. To a very great extent. It covers the entire citrus belt of the State. I can not say that all portions of the citrus-growing sections are affected.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is it very disastrous?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is absolutely disastrous and very infectious. Anything that goes through it—a cow passing through a grove has been found to carry the disease. Even an ice wagon passing from one grove to another has carried it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Have they discovered the germ?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have not yet found it. That is one thing the department are studying in connection with the State authorities, but they have not yet found what its origin is or the nature of the disease.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Nor what it is?

Mr. FLETCHER. No. The only thing that they know is that they must absolutely burn every tree or plant or shrub on which they find the disease.

The department says:

The citrus growers of Florida, working in cooperation with the State experiment station and nursery inspection service, have organized a campaign of eradication, which has been vigorously prosecuted during the past four months with a fair prospect of success if it can be adequately prosecuted throughout all the infected areas within that State during the winter months, when the trees are dormant and the spread of the disease is much less rapid than during the active growing season, which begins about midwinter and continues through spring and summer.

I will ask to have this report go in the Record. I will not read it all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Permission will be granted, unless there is objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Memorandum for item to be included in the urgent deficiency bill for the Bureau of Plant Industry.]

PROPOSED WORDING.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the infectious nature and the continued spread of the destructive

disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as may, in his judgment, be necessary, \$35,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to pay such expenses and employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

EXPLANATION.

Within the past few weeks the attention of this department has been called to the destructive epidemic of citrus canker, a recently introduced disease, in the grapefruit districts of Florida and the Gulf States. Circumstantial evidence indicates that the disease was introduced into Texas from Japan about 1911, but because of its close resemblance to citrus scab, which had for some time been known in that State, it was not at the time recognized as a distinct disease, nor was its destructive nature discovered until a few months ago.

The experience of the past year has demonstrated that it is highly infectious to practically all kinds of citrus trees, affecting roots, trunks, old limbs, small twigs, leaves, and fruit. Although the diseased trees may continue to live in a very unthrifty and feeble condition, the effect of the disease is to promptly destroy the marketability of the fruit and therefore the earning capacity of the tree. It has been found to be especially destructive upon grapefruit, limes, and lemons, and to be spread from tree to tree through contact with cultivators, vehicles, the harness used on horses in the groves, and by the pruning tools, clothing, and hands of the workmen performing the ordinary cultural and harvesting operations.

Though the disease has been under investigation in the States of Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana during the past year no means of prevention or control through the use of fungicides or other spray applications has yet been developed, the treatments found effective for most fungous diseases of plants having failed to control citrus canker.

The only method of control which appears to be effective is the complete eradication of the disease from those regions most likely to suffer severely by its continued presence, through the destruction by burning of all infected nursery stock and of all infected trees in citrus groves.

From the commercial and financial standpoints the greatest danger is to the grapefruit industry of Florida. The best information available through commercial sources indicates that the annual shipments of grapefruit from that State now exceed 3,000,000 boxes. The grapefruit plantings in Florida are valued at approximately \$75,000,000. The entire citrus industry of the State, involving investments amounting to approximately \$200,000,000, will be jeopardized unless the disease is brought promptly under control. The citrus industries of the other Gulf States are also endangered, although less so than those of Florida, because of the smaller percentage of grapefruit trees in those States and the relatively larger proportion of Satsuma oranges in these plantings, this variety being much less seriously damaged by the canker than most of the citrus fruits.

The citrus growers of Florida, working in cooperation with the State Experiment Station and Nursery Inspection Service, have organized a campaign of eradication which has been vigorously prosecuted during the past four months with a fair prospect of success if it can be adequately prosecuted throughout all the infected areas within that State during the winter months when the trees are dormant and the spread of the disease is much less rapid than during the active growing season, which begins about midwinter and continues through spring and summer. Unfortunately the State authorities are without funds to meet the expenses of systematic inspection of the groves and the destruction of diseased trees by burning. The State legislature does not meet until April, and such action as it may take in the matter will not be in time to meet the emergency. The situation is particularly urgent in that it has recently been discovered that several hundred shipments of young trees from a nursery now known to have been infected were made to planters at various points in the State before the destructive character of the disease was discovered. The successful prosecution of the eradication campaign necessitates the immediate following up and location of all of the stock contained in these shipments and the inspection of the adjacent groves before the next general infection period occurs.

In the absence of appropriations available to meet the expenses of the systematic inspection and eradication work, the citrus growers have during the past few weeks raised approximately \$30,000 by subscription for this purpose. This amount is inadequate for the accomplishment of the work within the period in which it must be done, and in view of the menace to the important interests at stake in Florida and other Gulf States, it creates an exigency which this department should be authorized to meet.

It is therefore recommended that Congress be requested to include in the urgent deficiency bill an item appropriating \$35,000 to enable the department to cooperate with the State authorities and fruit-growers associations in Florida and other Gulf States, with a view to accomplishing the eradication of the disease from the regions in which it has proved destructive, during the next few months. It is estimated that this amount will be required for the employment of competent men in cooperation with the State authorities and growers' organizations, and the meeting of the necessary field expenses. No reimbursement of the value of trees destroyed in the eradication work is contemplated. To effectively accomplish this purpose the funds should be available by January 1, since to defer the work until later in the season would render impossible the eradication of the disease from the present comparatively restricted centers of infection and permit of its spread to an extent that would probably place it beyond control.

Mr. FLETCHER. In the report it is shown that the time for taking care of the disease is between the 1st of January and the 1st of April, and unless the work is performed then enormous damage will be done.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to ask the Senator how does it affect the trees. Does it kill the tree or cause the fruit to drop?

Mr. FLETCHER. It gradually saps the vitality of the tree and also affects injuriously the fruit.

Mr. GALLINGER. I observe the Senator was not quite correct in saying that it does not affect the orange crop.

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not understand the Senator. I thought he asked about peaches.

Mr. GALLINGER. I meant to ask about oranges, if I said peaches.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator said peaches. It does affect all the citrus varieties. I do not think it affects peaches or apples.

Mr. GALLINGER. The testimony shows that the value of the grapefruit industry of Florida is approximately \$75,000,000. That is a very great industry; and, really, from reading the testimony it does seem that this is a very serious matter and that the Government might well come to the aid of the people of the States where the industry is affected and render some help. It seems the people of Florida themselves have raised \$30,000,000 for this purpose. I hope the provision in the bill will remain.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to say that as a member of the committee I had first the impression that it would be best for this appropriation to be made in the agricultural appropriation bill, but knowing that that bill has not yet passed the House of Representatives, and that likely it will not be submitted to the Senate for some time, and this being a matter of so urgent a nature, I felt that it ought to be included in this bill.

It is a meritorious appropriation. It is necessary that it should be available soon, because it takes time to send men to Florida to visit the various groves and pick out the trees that it is necessary to burn. Consequently, we are even now late in providing an appropriation of this nature.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to say a few words. I do not care to argue the proposition. It will be noticed that in the paragraph preceding this item an appropriation is made for the purchase and destruction of animals having the foot-and-mouth disease. In the same way as animals now living are hereafter to be killed and paid for, it might be said that that is not a deficiency.

This disease shows itself in Florida about July or August. The appropriation will not be used to pay for any property destroyed. Property of very great value has already been destroyed. They do not dare to cut the tree down and then burn it up, but they spread oil upon it and burn it where it stands.

I do not believe this matter would have been brought to the attention of Congress if it had not been for the fact that the Legislature of Florida does not meet until April, and, as stated by my colleague, if the Government is to render any assistance at all it must be done between now and that time.

Furthermore, I can see that a certain part of the responsibility for the spread of this disease can be charged directly to the Government. It was by no act of the citrus growers of Florida that this pest, whatever it is, came there. It was brought from Japan into Mexico and from Mexico into Texas, and then by the sale of nursery stock it got into the State of Florida. In that way the Government is more to blame than the State for allowing it to get there.

The Senator from Louisiana stated to me since this amendment has been under discussion that some nursery stock—a thousand trees or a thousand dollars' worth—had been shipped from Florida to Louisiana and burned there, and the nurseryman who gave the order, who was doing a very large business, has practically been made a bankrupt because practically all his nursery has been burned in order to get rid of this disease.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator know whether this citrus canker exists in Texas now?

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, yes; it exists in Texas. It was from Texas that within a very recent time it came to Florida. Of course, it had to come before July last, because it was spread over the groves in July.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], I desire to say that of the \$2,500,000 appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry, for the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, \$2,000,000 is a deficiency that has already been spent, and the additional \$500,000 is for the purpose of continuing the investigation and for the purchase and destruction of animals affected by the disease. That is quite different from the appropriation of \$35,000 for citrus fruit trees. The expenditure of the money and also the appropriation is under the act of February 27, 1906, and as provided in that act the loss of human life was involved. I would not want the Senator's statement to go uncorrected, because I think there is a difference between the appropriation of \$2,500,000 for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease and the appropriation of \$35,000 for the destruction of the citrus canker.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me ask the Senator if the half million dollars that has not been spent is not a deficiency at this time?

Mr. SMOOT. It is true it is not a deficiency, but I will say to the Senator that the Senate has already passed a bill appropriating not \$500,000 but \$1,000,000 for this same purpose.

Mr. BRYAN. That has been used to pay for the stock that has been destroyed.

Mr. SMOOT. And for the investigation.

Mr. BRYAN. This small appropriation to which the Senator objects can only be used for the purpose of scientific investigation and advice by the experts of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriation does not only apply to the destruction of animals that may have the foot-and-mouth disease, but it is also for the purpose of carrying on the work of investigation as to whether they have the foot-and-mouth disease and where located.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand. There is this distinction, however, a part of the money will be used for the payment of property, and under this provision no money will be used except for the purpose of investigation.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the payment for property comes under the present law. The Government is required to pay for the destruction of animals that may be suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. In the case of every animal that is destroyed the law compels the Government to pay for it.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word in regard to this item. My State is very much interested in the citrus industry. It is growing very rapidly in the State. I received a letter just a few days ago from a prominent citrus grower saying, if I recollect it correctly, that a thousand dollar shipment of citrus trees from Florida into the city of Hammond, State of Louisiana, had been seized by the agriculture authorities of the State and burned because the citrus canker was found among the trees. He asked me to watch this matter as closely as possible, and thought it was very important to this young and growing industry of the State that the disease should be eradicated.

I sincerely hope the appropriation will be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill, and read the next paragraph, as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

For "General expenses, Forest Service," including the same objects specified under this head in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, \$349,243.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, while I shall make no effort to amend this paragraph, the committee having disagreed with me, I want to give the Senate some facts in regard to this appropriation, and not only as to this department of the Government but also as to others.

The fiscal year 1914 began July 1, 1914, and will end June 30 of this year. An estimate came for an appropriation for the Forest Service. We gave them \$3,000,000. In addition to that we gave them \$250,000 for fighting fires. They have spent in six months \$671,000 for fighting fires. I am told by Senators from Western States that they have had no unusual fires out there. The department says they have; but here is a department estimating \$250,000, the Senate gives them everything they ask for, and in less than six months they have spent \$671,000. At 25 cents an hour, \$2 a day, it would take 25,000 men to fight fires for a month. I want to say that the departments come here with their estimates. They will make estimates some time for a large sum and we cut them down. Then they get around it by going and spending the money anyway and coming in here and asking us for a deficiency. This department had \$3,000,000. They had \$250,000 given them to spend for a year. They spent it in six months, then drew on the \$3,000,000 for \$72,000, and then for \$300,000 more, and then they come here within six months and ask us to make an appropriation of \$671,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. What would be the sum total of expenditures of this fiscal year for that department according to their estimates and expenses?

Mr. OVERMAN. If they go on in this way, there is no telling. They will again come back with a deficiency. For six months they have spent \$671,000 for fighting fires, when I am told by Senators from Western States that there have been actually no unusual fires out there this year. I am unable to guess; I do not know how much they will spend during the next six months. They already have had \$3,000,000 of appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I will state that we appropriated for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, \$3,243,000. Included in that amount was \$150,000 for fighting and preventing fires. Then, under miscellaneous items, in that bill there was added another \$100,000 for the purpose of fighting and preventing forest fires. That would make the appropriations for that one bureau a little over \$3,300,000. I do not know whether we shall have in the regular deficiency bill an additional amount asked for; but if what has been appropriated and what is carried in this bill is expended, it will amount to over three and a half million dollars for the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. That seems a large sum of money. Was there any hearing showing whether or not it had been properly expended or whether there had been any waste of the money, or anything of that kind?

Mr. OVERMAN. The only thing set out in the hearings, Mr. President, is that—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would ask if there is a proposition pending to strike out a part of the bill?

Mr. OVERMAN. No. I am merely calling attention to the matter. The money has been spent, and we ought to know how it has been spent. Something ought to be done with reference to it. I want to say to the Senator that I was in favor of striking out the provision and take the amount out of the balance of the \$3,000,000 appropriation which they have.

The Senator from Idaho asked me a question as to the hearings. The officers of the bureau stated that they have had some fires in Oregon, a few in Montana, and some in Washington. I am told by the Senators from those States that they have had no unusual fires out there. They say the money is spent chiefly in the employment of men, to whom 25 cents an hour is paid. That was expended entirely in fighting forest fires. Twenty-five cents an hour would be \$2 a day. The Senator can calculate how many men they have had employed—over 25,000 men.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that this debate is out of order unless there is some proposition pending. The reading of the bill can not be stopped to make speeches, unless there is something before the Senate to which the debate can be directed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I realize that the Chair is quite correct, and I therefore move, in line 5, on page 6, to strike out the appropriation "\$349,243."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That motion will leave merely the text without the appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is the way I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on that for just a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the acting chairman of the committee suggests that there were no unusual fires in the national forests last year.

Mr. OVERMAN. There were no unusual fires there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. He suggests that there were no unusual fires there, as he has been informed by Senators from that section. Since the bill was reported, Mr. President, I have taken it upon myself to ascertain what the number of fires was and in what particular States they occurred for which this money was expended. I may say—and this is authenticated by the records—that the fires during the past year, 1914, were more disastrous than any we have ever had, except those in 1910, in areas covered and in the number of fires which occurred. Those fires were distributed as follows:

In the first district, embracing Montana, northern Idaho, and North Dakota, there were 1,975 of such fires; in district No. 2, including Colorado, eastern Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Michigan, there were 279; in district No. 3, embracing Arizona and New Mexico, there were 509; in district No. 4, embracing Utah, Nevada, southern Idaho, and western Wyoming, there were 327; in district No. 5, California, there were 1,468; in district No. 6, embracing Oregon and Washington, there were 1,239; in district No. 7, embracing Arkansas, Florida, and the White Mountains—the Appalachian region—there were 315, such fires amounting in all to 6,112.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Does the report give any idea of the extent of the fires—how aggravated they were or how large?

Mr. OVERMAN. I can answer that question.

Mr. BORAH. I have seen some fires that it would not cost over 25 cents to put out.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question is answered in the report. Of the entire six thousand and odd fires which swept the forests, 81 per cent were handled without difficulty and with very small loss; 81 per cent of them did not cover over 10 acres.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want to say that that very statement justifies all the expenditures that have been made for the protection of our national forests. In 1910 there was a much larger area burned over, and the fires were more destructive, because the department did not then have the appliances necessary to fight such fires. I call attention to the fact as showing the increased efficiency of the service, which has been brought about by the expenditure of these moneys. I call attention to the further fact, Mr. President, that the expenditures for the Forestry Department have been gradually going down, notwithstanding the statement of some of my colleagues.

Now, as showing the increased efficiency of the organization over that of former years may be stated the results: In the Colville forest in 1910, with 62 fires, 155,200 acres were burned, with a cost for fire fighting of \$18,000; in 1914, with 103 fires, and a drier season, the total area burned was 7,653 acres, with a cost for fire fighting of \$15,900. Still again, in the Tahoe forest in 1910 there were 84 fires, and such a serious situation developed that the United States troops were called upon for aid. This year—and I call especial attention to this—there were 223 fires handled by the organization without help, and the loss was less.

In the Trinity Forest, where there were 51 fires in 1910, which burned over 23,192 acres, in 1914 53 fires burned over only 459 acres. In California, where there were quite a number of fires this year as compared with 1910, the average acreage per fire in 1910 was 653, while in 1914 it was but 37 acres; while the average for fires in the timber, excluding brush fires, was this year only 15 acres. In other words, the areas of the fires are each year diminishing because of the increased efficiency of the service. This increased efficiency has been brought about by the appropriation of money necessary to properly combat the fires.

I call attention to another thing, Mr. President. My distinguished colleague on the committee, who has this bill in charge, always, properly too, fights these so-called deficiency appropriations; but I call attention to the fact that in 1911 there was a million dollars included in the appropriation bill for the purpose of fighting forest fires, and yet none of it was expended. The next year they concluded in the next appropriation bill that inasmuch as no part of that had been expended they would make the appropriation very much less, and they appropriated but \$200,000. The next year they reduced it to \$100,000, and this year the Agricultural appropriation bill, which is pending before the House of Representatives, has eliminated this protection in the national forests from the bill altogether. So, under the law as it now stands the department has authority to increase these deficiencies, and if they are going to protect the property that belongs to the people of this whole country they must create these deficiencies against which Senators are now protesting here so loudly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that the RECORD may be straight, I wish to say that the million dollars, of which the Senator from Oregon speaks, for 1911, was a deficiency which was caused by fires in 1910. Does the Senator not remember that we had during the year 1910 extensive fires, which were attended by great loss of life in Idaho and also in a number of other Western States?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask the Senator from Utah to look at the records for 1910, wherein he will find that there was a million dollars included in the Agricultural appropriation bill, but it was not used at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite positive that the deficiency appropriation bill in 1911 carried an appropriation of a million dollars for the purpose of paying for the fighting of fires of 1910, in which year the country had the most disastrous fires which had occurred for very many years. I call attention to the statement of Mr. Graves, Chief Forester. He says:

Mr. GRAVES. The situation was that we had in the northwestern States and on the Pacific slope an unusual drought. We had a very

long dry season, equal in severity, so far as forest-fire hazard was concerned, to that of 1910.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the bad year?

Mr. GRAVES. Yes, sir; that was the bad year, when we had to come to Congress for a deficiency of about \$1,000,000. In some parts of the Northwest, particularly in Oregon and Washington, the drought was a long one, there being in Washington and Oregon 74 days without rain.

Therefore, I think the statement which the Senator made should at least be qualified, because in the year 1910, not only did they spend all of the money which was appropriated, but they came to the Congress of the United States and asked for a deficiency of a million dollars.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, my memory is not in accord with the Senator's upon that point, though he may be correct. My understanding of it is different, but it is a matter of easy verification by an examination of the appropriation bills. What I am getting at, however, is the fact that the appropriations for the purpose of protecting the national domain have been growing less each year, because the moneys which have been expended in times past have gone to increase the efficiency of the fire-fighting force.

Within the last four years great strides have been made in equipping the forests and in the organization of the force, as will be seen from the following figures: In the first place, during this time there have been added 1,368 miles of road, 9,617 miles of trail, 12,000 miles of telephone, 300 new fully equipped look-out stations, 695 headquarters buildings, and many other improvements. The forests have had a great increase of equipment in the way of tools and tool caches, portable telephones, tents, and so forth, as well as in transportation facilities.

Mr. President, all of these things for which these moneys have been expended in times past make it easier and cheaper for the Government to control the situation in the future. If the policy advocated by some Senators is carried out and we are absolutely to abandon the forests to destruction by the elements, then we might as well stop at one time as at another; but I, for one, Mr. President, will never consent to the elimination of items from the appropriation bills which go to protect this property which belongs to the people of the whole country.

I do not belong to the school of those who feel that the public domain should be opened up to the indiscriminate taking of everybody who comes along. I have just as good cause to complain as anybody, if there is cause to complain, because at least one-fifth of the area of my State, and probably more, is embraced within national forests; but, Mr. President, if I had it within my power to-morrow to release those lands for the purpose of settlement or acquisition by the public, I would not take such action, for the simple reason that until the homestead law and other statutes under which the public domain may be acquired shall have been amended the lands will be taken up in the future just as they have been taken up in the past.

Now, in my own State hundreds of thousands of acres of land belong to the Weyerhaeusers which ought to belong to the people and ought to be included within the reserves. Not only that, but the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. owns immense tracts of land that ought to belong to the people. Not only does the Northern Pacific own much land formerly a part of the public domain, but the Southern Pacific also owns great tracts of it.

Some of these lands have been acquired by great corporations in questionable ways. Some of them have been acquired through the efforts of dummy entrymen. School-teachers, schoolboys, and girls in department stores have been hired to go into the West—it is true of my State, and I think I can safely say the same statement is true of other States—and have entered lands, and as soon as title was acquired by going before the proper authorities and swearing falsely the lands have been turned over to great timber syndicates and railroad companies. That is what would happen if these lands were now open to entry.

I know my distinguished friend from Idaho differs very essentially from me as to this proposition. I go with him this far: I say that all the land in the Northwest within forest reserves which is more valuable for agricultural purposes than for timber or mineral purposes ought to be opened up to the public; but in my State, at least—and I think it is pretty generally true of the Senator's State—there is very little land included within the forest reserves that is more valuable for agricultural than for other purposes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has not yet made any statement of fact with which I disagree. If the Senator will assist me in eliminating from the forest reserves those lands which are

agricultural, I will raise no complaint whatever about retaining in the reserves the forest lands. I am only complaining of the withholding of agricultural lands while hundreds of good people are waiting to make them into farms.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the Senator and I have pretty generally worked together along that line. The only difference I have had with the Senator usually is that the Senator has always shown an indisposition, as it has seemed to me, to expend the necessary sums of money for the protection of the great forests that exist in his State and in mine.

Mr. President, the forests ought to be preserved, and the record here, the hearings before the House on this very bill, will show that the properties of the Government were protected with a less expenditure this year than they ever were before, and that the small amount which is now sought to be appropriated for the protection of the forests is a mere bagatelle in comparison with the value of that which was in danger of being destroyed, but which was not destroyed simply because the Forestry Bureau acted with efficiency and with zeal in the protection of the property of the Government.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator is through—I do not want to interrupt if he is not—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not believe I could say anything more to enlighten the Senate. I have no disposition to speak on the subject at any length, but I do want to protest against the parsimony that is displayed by some Senators, who, for the purpose of saving an appropriation of \$350,000 in round numbers, would incur the risk of losing millions of dollars in property which belongs to the people of this whole country.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that we can not possibly save it, because it has already been spent.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And property has been saved, too.

Mr. SMOOT. I say we can not save the appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I disagree very little with the Senator from Oregon, except as to possibly some of his conclusions and some of his generalizations. A few years ago I was driving across a portion of my State in company with a gentleman from Ohio, and when we were in the midst of a vast area of country I said to him, "You are now in a forest reserve." Apparently he challenged my veracity, and said, "It can not be possible that this is a forest reserve. Where is the forest?" There was not a tree in sight; over the vast plains the god of nature had never been able to grow a tree in all the years of the past. Some of it was as good agricultural land as any other part of the State of Idaho.

Mr. President, I have never voted against what I believed to be a sufficient amount of money to really protect our forest reserves. No one can be more concerned in the protection of the forests than those who live near the forests, because the destruction of the forests by fire is calculated to injure or destroy all that we have on the outside of the forests, and therefore I am thoroughly in favor of any appropriation, and am willing to make it liberal, for the protection of the forests. But, Mr. President, we discuss here the protection of forests which do not exist; that is to say, we are guarding and surveilling and superintending thousands and thousands of acres upon which there are no forests. These lands ought not to be there, to be watched over and policed at the people's expense; they ought to be producing wheat and hay and fruit and the other things which people stand in so much need of.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will not the Senator admit that within the past two or three years, as rapidly as the department has been able to do so, they have released from the reserves land that did not actually grow timber?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; they have been releasing some lands; they have released them very slowly, but if they will keep that up I will not complain about their being a little slow. However, Mr. President, when we began to demand the release of such lands the Senator will recall that we were met with the statement that there were no agricultural lands to be released, and it has only been by persistent presentation of the question time and time again that we have been able to secure action in releasing agricultural lands.

Mr. President, there are counties in my State which are practically covered by forest reserves; and it becomes a question of whether or not they can exist unless the land can properly be settled by homesteaders and people can be induced to live there who are willing to acquire title and to pay taxes to help sustain the Government, and therefore we are persistently asking that the agricultural lands be excluded from the forest reserves. When you shall have done so you will limit and re-

duce very largely indeed the amount of expenditures which are now being made. For that we contend, and for nothing more.

Let me call the Senator's attention to another fact. The Senator stated that these lands belong to the people, that these forests belong to the people. I agree with that proposition thoroughly; but I find, as I said upon the floor of the Senate a day or two ago, that within the last five years 500,000 of those same people, who were as good citizens as we had in this country, have gone into a foreign country and taken the oath of allegiance to a foreign Government in order to get lands upon which to build homes, while we have thousands and millions of acres tied up in forest reserves. I do not think I am opposing the interests of the people when I insist upon the right of dedicating our agricultural lands to those who desire to plant homes upon them. The best service I can give the people is to help the people get homes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I ask the Senator a question at this point?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. The trouble is, Mr. President, that the word "people" is used in such an intangible, abstract way that it does not do anyone any good to get a result for the benefit of the people, because there is nobody to be helped. I want to come down to the concrete, individual application of the law to the man who wants a home.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will ask the Senator is it not true that the inducement which has caused a great many American citizens to go into Saskatchewan, Alberta, and other sections of Canada has been the fact that they find there virgin territory and a condition precisely similar to that which pertained in our section of the country 40 years ago, when people from the eastern section of the United States went out West and settled upon land. They would go there in spite of the law. They have left our borders simply because there is virgin land to be taken in British Columbia while there is probably none to be taken in our country, even if the forest reserves were opened up to settlement.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes, Mr. President; they went there because there were virgin lands in Canada and because the virgin land in our territory had been covered into forest reserves. I agree with the Senator thoroughly that that is the reason why they went to Canada, and for the other reason that when they found a piece of land in Canada they could secure title to it sometime within the lifetime of a single individual. Canada, as the Senator knows, has a law which permits a homesteader to acquire title in three years, while until within the last two years our law required him to live upon the land for five years. That provision of the Canadian law, of course, induced considerable emigration to Canada, together with the fact that the land there was undoubtedly available. While there was also land in our country, it was not available.

Mr. President, I moved to strike out this item because I wanted more information regarding it. I presume that there is some portion of the proposed appropriation, perhaps all of it, for aught I know, that is justly in the bill. I have no desire to deny that which is needed, but I observe the same extravagance here as marks the whole of our Government expenditures. While we are remembering that these are the "people's" forests, that this is also the "people's" money we are spending.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I presume the Senator from Idaho made the motion in order to discuss this question.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before the Senator withdraws the motion to strike out, I desire to say a few words in answer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who said that I was in the habit of fighting deficiency appropriations. That is true, Mr. President. In 1906 the piling up of deficiencies by the departments grew into a scandal. Congress would make appropriations based upon the estimates of the departments, but, notwithstanding the appropriations thus made, they took the liberty—and this is true of all the departments; it is not confined to one—of spending all the money they wanted to spend here and there and everywhere, and then coming in with a deficiency.

The practice became such a scandal and an outrage that Congress itself passed a law designed to correct the evil. That law is now on the statute books, although I think it is not observed. I will read it into the RECORD right here in the hope that some of the departments will take notice of it and realize what the law is; perhaps they have forgotten about it. I think I am doing my duty when I examine all deficiency items to see whether or not they were properly incurred. Like the Senator from Idaho in this instance I have not enough evidence to justify me in moving to strike out the item; I can not tell much about it; but I know that they have spent in six months \$600,000, when their estimate—and we gave them every cent

they estimated for—was \$250,000. Here is the provision which Congress enacted in 1906:

Sec. 3679. No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

It is upon that idea, I suppose, that they have spent this \$600,000.

All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month.

Here is the statute; here is the law; and I want to give notice to the departments that I intend to examine critically all these deficiency items, because the law says that such expenditures shall not be incurred, and that the departments shall not spend more money than is appropriated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho withdraw the amendment proposed by him?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, Mr. President, the law referred to by the Senator from North Carolina is really a very subtle piece of humor, so far as that is concerned.

I wish to say just one word more before I withdraw the amendment. The Senator from Oregon spoke about settlers acquiring homes, making homesteads, and so forth, upon these lands. I want to say, for fear I may be considered as misrepresenting the situation, that there is a provision in the law by which a man can go in a forest reserve and secure a homestead within a forest reserve; but in the application of that law the conditions are so onerous that settlers have practically ceased to avail themselves of it, and for this reason: A man goes into a forest reserve and makes application to file upon a piece of land. The application is considered, and may be granted or may not be; or the forestry officials may permit him to experiment for a time to see whether or not he can make a success of farming on that particular piece of ground, say, in one or two years; and if so, at the end of that time they will grant him a title. So in the application of the law it is practically a dead letter, for the reason that no man, unless he has a large bank account, can afford to go upon these lands and experiment at the discretion of some one in the department as to whether or not he can make a home.

What we ought to have is a law defining what the man shall do; and after he shall have complied with the terms of the law the power ought not to reside in any man to deny him his title or to his homestead; but when it is left to the discretion of the department, and the man is a man of limited means, he can not cope with the situation, and the result is that they have practically ceased to acquire homesteads under this law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should not say anything concerning this matter except for the statements which have been made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I differ from him so thoroughly with respect to those matters that I want to state the facts with reference to the expenditures for the Forest Service.

The Forestry Service had an appropriation for 1912 of \$5,217,000. The receipts were \$2,109,000. I leave out the odd dollars and odd cents. The loss to the Government was \$3,108,000. Now, when you consider that of the amount which the Government received 35 per cent was paid over to the State it leaves a deficit, so far as the United States Treasury is concerned, of \$3,800,000. In other words, the Government is getting and putting into its own Treasury from grazing rentals and sales of timber only \$1 out of every \$3 that it expends. The appropriation for 1913 was \$5,092,111, and the expenditures were \$2,391,920, which leaves a deficit, so far as the United States is concerned, in actual expenditures above receipts of \$2,700,000. Considering the fact that out of these receipts the

Government pays 35 per cent to the State—25 per cent for school purposes and 10 per cent for road purposes—the result is that it left a deficit, so far as the United States was concerned, of \$3,490,000. The appropriation we made last fall was even greater than these appropriations.

When it comes to the appropriation made here it shows that even the figures I have quoted do not show the total loss to the Government, because we are now adding \$349,000 to the loss of the United States. I am one of those who believe that when we have a law we ought to comply with it and try to carry out its provisions. I am not here to move to strike out this appropriation, nor am I here to cripple the service, because it was a necessary expenditure under existing law; but I want to call the attention of the Senate—and this seems to be a good opportunity—to the fact that we are making appropriations for the Forestry Service year after year and expending practically \$3 to \$1 of net receipts to the Government.

Mr. President, that was the same experience this Government had with the leasing system of the early part of the last century as applied to the lead mines in Territories. That was just exactly the result, namely, an expenditure upon the part of the Government of \$4 for every dollar it collected in royalty. These broad forest reserves have been spread over our States in a manner that makes it almost impossible for counties to maintain their schools and their county governments, because the reserved lands are not liable to taxation, notwithstanding State, county, and school governments must be maintained over them. In my State they have already withdrawn coal lands which the Government of the United States estimates to be worth \$500,000,000. Is it possible that the Commonwealth of Colorado can afford to let lands of the value of \$500,000,000 remain without taxation for the support of State, county, and school governments? Is that right?

The trouble with all these leasing propositions—and the forest-reserve system is a leasing proposition—is that they are attacking the very sovereignty of the State, because if there is one principle that is recognized above another it is that a State has the right to impose taxes upon every foot of territory within its borders. Whenever you deny that right, you deny to the State the right of existence, and you deny the means of support to the State government itself. No one approves fraudulent land entries, and the Government has the means of preventing the same.

I want to say, with respect to the forest reserves in my State, that 40 per cent of them are upon lands that are above timber line, where nothing but bushes exists. Not only that, but in my State 30 per cent of the same is what is called scrub timber. Consequently there is only 30 per cent left that is merchantable timber. The result is that these reserves ought to be cut down to the 30 per cent of good timber. That is what ought to be done. The present Secretary of Agriculture has cut them down to some extent. I think the forest reserves in my State have been reduced from 16,000,000 acres to 14,500,000 acres, but two-thirds of that area ought not to receive the attention of the Government. These large reserves embarrass and prevent the development of the country, discourage miners from going in there, because there is always a supervision which the miner objects to, and because of the rules and regulations made by the department with respect to having somebody pass upon whether the mine is a pay mine or is likely to become a paying mine, and making the title to the mine dependent upon such inspection after the miner has performed his \$500 worth of work.

This appropriation is to repay a past expenditure. I believe that when a necessity arises in order to prevent fire the expenditure ought to be reimbursed. We ought sometimes to go to the fundamentals, and restrict these forest reserves to something that is within the bounds of reason, so that we will not have gigantic forest reserves equal to the area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island combined in my own State.

Mr. President, while I believe in this appropriation, and voted for it in the Committee on Appropriations, in view of the statement which was made by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to voice my protest against the manner in which this system has been carried on. When we consider reforestation it is absolutely absurd, so far as my State is concerned. This very Agricultural Department has reported that a pine tree grown at an altitude of 7,500 feet in my State takes 200 years to develop to a thickness of 19.6 inches.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator a question—possibly I understand the matter without having the Senator enlighten me—as to the method adopted in establishing these forest reserves. Is it an arbitrary method on the part of the

officials of the Government to select a section of country which they say shall become a forest reserve?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that their opinion prevails?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They generally send out a commission, and they take in broad areas. In my State 16,000,000 acres was taken in. It has been reduced to 14,500,000 acres, but that is equal to two or three small States. The fact that it takes in all character of lands, including 65 per cent of the mineral belt of my State, has impaired our mineral development to such an extent that in 1900 we had in the State of Colorado 41,000 metalliferous miners, and the last census—1910—showed that we had but 19,000. The miners will not prospect under those conditions, and thereby a development of the country is retarded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will further ask the Senator as to the feeling that exists in the State of Colorado on this question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, it exists to a very strong extent. The Democratic platforms and the Republican platforms for years have both, in most vigorous terms, assaulted the entire policy. We are willing to have forest reserves, but we want genuine forest reserves. This thing of talking about reforestation is absurd in my State. It may be that in some portions of the United States it might be proper, but where it takes 200 years to grow a tree it is absurd to talk about reforestation. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] says, we want forests with trees in them.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is entirely right on that point. I am a great friend of forestry and of the Forest Service in a general way, but I ask the Senator the question because I have absorbed the belief, from hearing these debates so eloquently presented by Senators from the great States of the West, that there ought to be some remedy for the existing conditions. Can the Senator suggest any?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, I suggest that these forest reserves be cut down to what is forest land; and if that is done, 70 per cent would be eliminated in my State.

Mr. GALLINGER. What would be the modus operandi to accomplish that result?

Mr. SHAFROTH. To limit the reserve. You could do it either by a bill or direct that it be cut down, or it could be done by Executive order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely; but if it was not done by Executive order, then I assume it would require legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes; it would require legislation if it were not done by Executive order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Are strenuous efforts being made, or is consideration being given to the propriety of legislation touching this matter?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, Mr. President, instead of that we have under consideration in committees of this Congress the fastening upon us of a leasing system not only of all of the coal lands, but also of the phosphate lands, the asphaltum lands, and the water-power sites, requiring the payment of royalties to the Government of the United States, to be divided between the Government and the States after they have been turned into the reclamation fund and have been repaid by the people of the West.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have heard objections strenuously urged against the existing condition of things by Senators from Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, I think California, and possibly other States. It seems to me that if the Senators from those States would unite in an effort to remedy what seems to be an evil, they would find support enough from the rest of us to accomplish the result.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that an effort was made a few years ago to limit what we thought was the undue exercise of departmental discretion, and both Houses of Congress passed a law providing that in certain States no further reservations should be made except by affirmative action of Congress. That law passed both Houses of Congress and was before the department for its consideration; but before that law was signed by the President, in defiance of the expressed will of Congress, more than 11,000,000 additional acres were put into these reserves.

The Senator asks how these reserves are created, whether by arbitrary power or not. The answer was made that commissions are sometimes sent out. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the very inception of this movement was when the Congress of the United States appropriated \$25,000 to send out a commission to look over this western country and recommend to the President what lands should be included

within the reserves. That commission expended the \$25,000. They made a report to the President. Upon that report and other information the President acted; and yet it developed, upon hearing, that that commission, spending \$25,000, did not go near the land, nor had they any personal observation or knowledge of the land which they recommended should go into the reserve.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that connection I will say that I have frequently been told and I have frequently read that these forest reserves are usually selected by certain gentlemen looking through a car window, and that they do not exercise the care that ought to be exercised in a matter of such great importance.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I want to say, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the western Senators have at various times introduced bills, and there are a number of bills now pending, dealing with this subject. The difference between the bills that are introduced by most of the western Senators is one which appeals to the question of entry and location by which title can be obtained and by which the State can have the right of taxation upon the property; whereas the bills that have been introduced by others relate to the leasing or royalty system by which title never leaves the Government, which means perpetual ownership in the Federal Government and which means consequently the exemption of these lands from State, county, and school taxation forever. When you consider that in the West 30 years' payment of taxes upon any property with reasonable interest upon each yearly payment amounts to the value of the land, you can readily see that the people of this western country are taxed every year the value of this land to maintain government over these forest reserves and other resources of the public domain that are proposed to be the subject of royalty.

Mr. President, I do not want to discuss the matter. I believe that this appropriation ought to be allowed, because it is a necessary expenditure that has been made; fundamentally there ought to be a change in the entire forestry system.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, just a word before I withdraw the amendment.

I do not desire that my position in regard to these forest reserves shall be misunderstood, and I repeat what I have said before, in a more explicit way, that I have no objection to forest reserves as such. I am thoroughly in favor of forest reserves when they are created upon forest lands; and if we could have eliminated from the forest reserves those lands which are purely agricultural lands and fit for making homes and farms, practically all the opposition to the forest reserves would disappear from the West.

I made this suggestion with reference to striking out this item for the same reason that I have called it to the attention of the Senate before. I want to keep before the Senate what I believe to be true from personal observation and personal examination—that there are not only thousands but hundreds of thousands of acres within these forest reserves upon which timber has never grown, which are more valuable for agriculture than for timber, which are fitted for the purpose of making homes, and those are the lands we are asking to have opened to entry.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho is withdrawn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the Senator withdraws his amendment I simply wish to say a word by way of explanation.

I voted for this provision in the committee. I did so because of the fact that the money has been spent. I also want to say that of all the money that is spent in the Forest Service, that which is spent for protection against fire is the money that is best spent. I do not, however, approve of having a deficiency appropriation for even this purpose every year; and I think myself that in the future either there ought to be a larger appropriation made for this purpose, or there should not be so much money spent as there has been. I want to express the opinion that the agricultural bill should carry a larger appropriation for this purpose, and that we should not have a deficiency every year.

My own State is not so largely withdrawn for forest purposes as some of the other Western States, although there are counties in my State where 93 per cent of the land is now withdrawn from entry, and out of the other 7 per cent all the taxes must be obtained for the maintenance of government. It is an impossibility for that part of our country to receive sufficient taxes to carry on the government as it ought to be carried on.

I believe in the Forest Service; that is, I believe that the real forest lands ought to be withdrawn from entry. I believe that the Forest Service ought to control those lands, but I do not believe that agricultural lands ought to be withdrawn as

forest lands. I now predict that if there is not a change in the policy, if the agricultural lands are not eliminated from the withdrawals, action will be taken by Congress, for the situation is intolerable. There is no one in my State, however, who is not perfectly willing that all of the forest lands should be withdrawn as such. They approve of it. It has been a blessing to the people, from the fact that we have so very little timber in our State; but it has gone a long, long way beyond the actual forest lands. As I stated before, I believe the time will come when the agricultural lands will be open for entry, and will not be allowed to remain in forest reserves.

I approve this appropriation; I voted for it in committee, and I shall vote for it in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, unfortunately I was absent from the Senate on other matters during the early discussion of this item; but I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I understand that where the bill speaks of "general expenses, Forest Service," it is intended to cover expenditures for fire.

Mr. OVERMAN. Fire fighting. It is in addition to the \$250,000 appropriated for this purpose for the year beginning July 1, 1914.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Can the chairman inform us as to the items making up this expenditure?

Mr. OVERMAN. No item except one—so many employees at 25 cents an hour.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. How many?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would take 25,000 men, working a month apiece, to make up this amount.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Has the Senator any notion that that condition of affairs existed? Was there anything before the committee, in the estimate or otherwise, to show what items entered into that expenditure?

Here is my reason for asking the question: I suppose we provide, in the general Agricultural bill, for a staff in the Forestry Service which will be used in fighting fires. I am curious to know how they could incur an extra expense to the amount of \$400,000 for performing the service for which their department is already organized. The Senator says they pay 25 cents an hour.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the way it was spent. The Senator will find from the hearings that that is the only estimate that was given. The men were employed at 25 cents an hour. That is the way the money was expended.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Has the Senator gone into the matter to ascertain how many men it would take and for how long in fighting fire?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would be \$2 a day for one man. It would take 300,000 men a day, or 30,000 men 10 days. The Senator can make the calculation as well as I can.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wanted to know whether this was just a lump sum, or whether it was appropriated as we have been accustomed to appropriate for the Forestry Service, without detailed specifications as to what it was for; that is all.

Mr. OVERMAN. All we know is that we appropriated \$250,000 upon their estimate, and six months thereafter they come in here with a request for \$371,000 more, saying that they have used this money, have spent it in employing men to fight fires, and it was not much of a fire year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Idaho having been withdrawn, the Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES.

Lighthouse tender, general service: For constructing and equipping a lighthouse tender for general service, authorized by the act approved March 4, 1913, \$250,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, before going further I want to say just a word with reference to this item under the Lighthouse Service.

There is an item there of \$250,000 for a lighthouse tender for the Pacific coast. That is a matter in which our people have been very much interested heretofore, and the Secretary himself has urged that we need a larger boat. The Senate at the last session passed a bill increasing the limit of cost of that boat from \$250,000 to \$325,000, and such a bill was favorably reported by the committee in the House.

I offered an amendment, intended to be proposed to this bill, to increase the amount to \$325,000. I did that largely because of the action of the Senate at the previous session, and also because the Secretary of Commerce had urged this increase very strongly in his report, and had pointed out very strong reasons why it should be made.

It has developed, however, possibly even since he made his report, that conditions on the Pacific coast are such that it is very likely that a larger vessel than was contemplated originally for \$250,000 can be secured now for \$250,000; and the Secretary has assured me that it is his judgment that with this \$250,000 he can probably get a vessel that will take care of the situation as he contemplated caring for it in his recommendation for the increase in the limit of cost. Therefore I have not pressed, and will not press, the amendment I introduced for the purpose of offering it to this provision, but I desire to make this statement in the RECORD, so that the facts may be known.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Missouri if it will suit his convenience to have the Senate go into executive session now?

Mr. STONE. There is an item in the bill, Mr. President, which has been passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. One only.

Mr. STONE. I am informed that it will likely take some time in debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can not hear the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I said that there is an item in the pending bill that has been passed over, and I am told that some Senators desire to debate that item, or some matters connected with it, possibly at some length. In view of that fact, if it is agreeable to the Senator from North Carolina—

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the bill may be laid aside for the purpose of going into executive session. It becomes then, as I understand, the unfinished business to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. There is no need of laying the bill aside. We can simply go into executive session.

Mr. OVERMAN. It comes up automatically. I thought probably I might move to take it up during the morning hour. It will come up automatically after 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, certainly it will. This bill is now the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be well enough to notify the Senate now that unanimous consent was given to laying aside temporarily the so-called shipping bill, which was the unfinished business.

Mr. LODGE. But this bill, Mr. President, was not taken up by unanimous consent. It was taken up on motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that. It did not affect the other bill, however.

Mr. LODGE. That displaces the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. However, that is a matter to be disposed of to-morrow.

Mr. STONE. We will dispose of that matter when we get to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What motion does the Senator make now?

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 55 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 5, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1915.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Martin F. Faury to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

Mary A. Carroll, Treadwell.

GEORGIA.

James J. Gordy, Richland.
Robert L. Horne, Ludowici.

ILLINOIS.

Ben Campbell Allensworth, Pekin.
Joseph V. Campeggio, Ladd.
I. C. Davidson, Carthage.
W. H. Hefferan, Rockford.
Frederick D. Jay, Elmwood.

MAINE.

Joseph A. Kenney, South Paris.
Frank B. Hills, Thomaston.
John W. Hutchins, Fryeburg.

MICHIGAN.

Horatio J. Abbott, Ann Arbor.
John F. McInerney, Wyandotte.
W. L. Tinham, Northville.

MINNESOTA.

S. G. Anderson, Hutchinson.
Charles F. Cook, Austin.
Oscar T. Stromme, Elbow Lake.

TEXAS.

J. L. Sandel, Saratoga.

VIRGINIA.

John W. Kellam, Onley.
William G. Stevenson, Accomac.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 4, 1915.
Marjorie J. Bloom to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 4, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, source of light and life and love, our God, our Father, pardon, we beseech Thee, our infirmities; take away our sinful desires and help us to make our lives sublime by the excellence of our thought and the rectitude of our behavior, that Thy kingdom may come in all its fullness and Thy will be done in our lives, that we may hallow the name of our Father in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 2, 1915, was read and approved.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN OREGON LANDS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 49) to provide for the exchange with the State of Oregon of certain school lands and indemnity rights within the national forests of that State for an equal area of national-forest land.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. BORLAND. I rise to reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. To object to passing it without prejudice?

Mr. BORLAND. To object to the request; yes.

There is no rule we can make that is not subject to the most gross abuse, and this rule, putting bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, is as grossly abused as any rules of this House. Here is the whole first page of this calendar devoted to the titles of bills that have been passed over repeatedly without prejudice. The result is that a bill at the end of the Calendar for Unanimous Consent will have no chance of consideration at this session. Now, we are intending to-day to take up, in the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, time that, considering the limited time that we have, ought to be devoted to appropriation bills, and gentlemen are going to get up here and argue over these propositions on this first page as to whether the bills shall or shall not be passed without prejudice. Now, why do gentlemen put their bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and then repeatedly ask that they be passed without prejudice, when they know it is to the prejudice of every other Member in the House even to make such a request?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill under consideration was the subject of discussion two weeks ago, but was passed over in order that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] and myself might get together on an amendment. I have just returned to the city this morning and we have not been able to come to any

agreement on the amendment, so the gentleman, so as not to take up any time in the consideration of it, immediately asked to have it passed over without prejudice. If these other bills are passed over as promptly as the gentleman from Oregon attempted to get this one passed over this morning, it will not interfere with the consideration of bills at the bottom of the calendar.

Mr. BORLAND. I have no disposition to prejudice the gentleman from Oregon; but if he asks that the bill be passed without prejudice it ought to be accompanied by a request that it go to the heel of the docket, and give everybody else a fair chance at this calendar. I have not a single bill on this calendar, so I feel perfectly free to speak about it. The gentleman has no right to hold the head of the calendar day after day with a bill that he is going to ask to have passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] asks that this bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Is the gentleman from Indiana going to object?

Mr. COX. No; I am not going to object.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] objected to passing the bill without prejudice. Did anyone object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARNER. No one objected to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have it reported first?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it. The Chair will make the same request of the House that he made a year ago, and that is that when the title of a bill is read, if any gentleman has made up his mind resolutely to object to it, let him object then.

Mr. GARNER. What are you going to do? Are you going to object?

Mr. STAFFORD. We are going to consider it now.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SINNOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over and go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over and go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to that request.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I do not believe that is a good practice to begin.

Mr. BORLAND. Then let it go off. Unanimous consent is a special privilege, anyway.

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly. I am not complaining if the gentleman objects. The same thing will apply to a number of other bills.

Mr. BORLAND. I am willing that the bill be considered now. If it can not be considered now, it has no place on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. The rule ought to be that if a bill is passed over it shall go to the bottom of the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says he is not ready to consider it to-day, but will be in two weeks.

Mr. BORLAND. Then it ought not to be on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects to the request that it be passed without prejudice and go to the foot of the calendar, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of certain Members on this side, I will object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the